FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 100

23 May 1983

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Kornilov on Reagan's UPI Interview on Missiles AA 1
PRAVDA Editorial Views Ways To Halt Arms Race [21 May] AA 1
Shalygin Discusses Resumption of MBFR Talks AA 3
GDR Journalist Cited on Luns' Geneva Talks Stand AA 4

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]
Scientists' Disarmament Conference CC 1
Geneva Talks, Euroweapons CC 3
USSR Proposals, U.S. Stance CC 4
Williamsburg Summit CC 5
Lebanon 'Agreement' CC 7
Dos Santos Visit 'Useful' CC 8
'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 9
[Kachanov, Shishkin, Belyayev]
Arms Policy, Positions CC 9
U.S. Policy in Turkey CC 11
Situation in Chad CC 12
FRG Developments CC 13
Scientists' Disarmament Conference Concludes CC 14
Academy Vice President Speaks CC 14
Damage to Nature CC 14
PRAVDA Sums Up Conference [20 May] CC 15
Press Conference Held [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 May] CC 17
Academy President Meets Press CC 18
Scientists' Appeal [PRAVDA 21 May] CC 19
IZVESTIYA Cites Participants [20 May] CC 21

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Extols 'Rabid Militarism' on Armed Forces Day A 1
PRAVDA Cites TASS on U.S. Arms Buildup, Plans [20 May] A 1
PRAVDA Scores U.S. 'Imperialist' Policy [18 May] A 3
IZVESTIYA Notes U.S. Churches' Antinuclear Protest [16 May] A 5
Moscow on New U.S. 'Secret Service' Organization [Olin] A 6
Mikheyev Remarks A 7
TASS Reports Turner 'Revelations' of CIA Plans A 7

SOUTH ASIA

Further Unusual Reports on Afghanistan Aired D 1
Tribes Fight 'Soviet Invaders' D 1
Later Broadcast Altered D 1
Report by Different Newscaster D 1
Afghan Tribal Representatives' Assembly Reported D 2
Alleged Herat Combat Operations Denied D 2

EASTERN EUROPE

AUCCTU's Shalayev on 'Working Visit' to Poland F 1
Begins Activities 18 May [TRUD 20 Mat] F 1
Visits Krakow Combine [TRUD 21 May] F 2
Meets Jaruzelski [TRUD 22 May] F 3

WESTERN EUROPE

TASS Reports on June NATO Air Exercises G 1
Turkish Refusal of U.S. Transmitters Noted G 1
[Bolshakov in PRAVDA 13 May]
USSR Prepared for Further Cooperation With FRG G 2
USSR-Luxembourg Political Consultations Held G 2

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Expansion of U.S.-Israeli 'Aggression' Scored H 1
Further on Lebanese-Israeli Troop Agreement H 1
'Successful Deal' Scorned H 2
'Wider Consequences' Viewed H 3
Further Views H 4
Syrian Defense Minister Cited H 4
Anti-Zionist Group Cited [PRAVDA 18 May] H 5
PLO Enovy Cited H 6
TASS Reports Killing of Soviet Nuns in Jerusalem H 6

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Additional Information on Dos Santos USSR Visit J 1
Kiev Hosts Delegation J 1
Moscow Departure Comparison J 2
Soviet-Angolan Communique [PRAVDA 21 May] J 3
Telegram to Andropov [PRAVDA 22 May] J 6
Soltan Commentary J 7

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

TASS Assails Reagan Remarks on Latin America K 1
Security Council Nicaragua Debate Reported K 2
[IZVESTIYA 20 May 83]
Report on Resolution K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Sakharov Emigration Controversy Continues	R 1
Refused Medical Treatment [AFP]	R 1
Academy of Sciences 'Indignant'	R 1
Moldavia's Grossu Urges Greater Party Initiative [PRAVDA 8 May]	R 2
PRAVDA Editorial on Party Work Shortcomings [12 May]	R 5

KORNILOV ON REAGAN'S UPI INTERVIEW ON MISSILES

LD201634 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 May 83

[Text] Aggressive U.S. circles are pursuing, against the will of the peoples, their course of deploying new medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe. This was reaffirmed yet again by U.S. President Reagan in his interview with UPI just published in the United States. He also asserted that the process of deploying the new U.S. missiles will supposedly take place concurrently with further negotiations with the USSR on limiting nuclear weapons.

Here is the latest news commentary, with TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov:

The U.S. President's statement is not the first such statement by the West. Certain circles in Washington and NATO, who are stubbornly pursuing a course of altering the approximate parity of forces established in Europe and in the world to their advantage, are endeavoring to accustom people to the idea that, supposedly, the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in Europe will not allegedly run counter to the task of the negotiations now being held in Geneva, the latest round of which opened on 17 May.

But this is an error, if not a deliberate distortion of the true situation. It is perfectly clear -- and this is directly or indirectly recognized even by many sober-minded Western political figures and Western military specialists -- that the appearance in West Europe of new U.S. missiles aimed at our country, our friends and allies, will result not only in no increase in Europe's security but, on the contrary, the nuclear threat to Europe will escalate sharply because the U.S. missiles, with a range of 2,500 km, are first-strike weapons designed for waging nuclear war on the continent. In other words, the question is not one of a simple arithmetical addition of almost 600 new missiles to the U.S. strategic potential, but concerns the creation of a new, qualitatively different strategic situation not only in Europe but also beyond it. It is a question of U.S. attempts to rely on force in its policy, by acquiring a longer and sharper nuclear sword, and to dictate its will to sovereign peoples and countries.

With this in mind, it must be clearly stated that the thesis propagated in Washington that a situation could supposedly arise in which the deployment of U.S. missiles will begin in West Europe while the Geneva talks proceed independently of this as if nothing had happened is a spurious thesis designed to delude the public. The NATO capitals cannot but know that by deploying its new missiles the U.S. side will effectively undermine the ground under the talks on nuclear weapons.

Our country's stance is clear and unambiguous. The USSR is resolutely and purposefully in favor of curbing the arms race in Europe and beyond, and it is precisely toward the achievement of this end that the peace-loving, constructive Soviet initiatives are directed. If matters were to reach the point where U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles are deployed in West Europe, a chain reaction will become inevitable and reciprocal measures by the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact member countries will become effective. No one should have any doubts on this score.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL VIEWS WAYS TO HALT ARMS RACE

PM230951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "To Act in the Name of Peace"]

[Text] The times we live in are marked by the mighty upsurge of the movement for peace and by the intensification of antiwar sentiments.

This is no chance phenomenon: the peoples are becoming increasingly aware of the great danger accompanying the arms race unleashed by imperialism and continuing to grow through the latter's fault, the danger associated with the raging militarist aspirations which have gripped the U.S. administration and the NATO ringleaders. They are continually increasing the stakes in the risky game connected with the militarization of space and the development of new types of nuclear missiles, lasers, radiological, chemical, bacteriological, and other means of mass annihilation.

The aggressive forces of imperialism which are leading the situation toward a nuclear missile catastrophe are opposed by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, and by the daily strengthening movement of peace champions.

"The mass antiwar movements are an important factor in favor of peace," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov remarked in reply to the questions of representatives of a number of Finnish public organizations. "Statesmen and governments cannot fail to heed this factor if they value the opinion of their own peoples."

The search for ways to curb the arms race is today agitating the hearts and minds of millions of people. Recent events attest to the growing scale of the antiwar movement. The Week of Actions for European Security and Cooperation has just ended. In Bonn and Paris, London and Prague, Sofia and Brussels -- in practically all the capitals of our continent -- it was marked by mass demonstrations and rallies.

The voice of Soviet people is inseparable from the many-million-strong voice of the champions of peace on all continents. On Soviet soil the week of actions was marked by peace marches, rallies, meetings, and "people's campaigns" under antiwar slogans. Muscovites brought the week to a close with a vivid, impressive rally in Luzhniki. Those taking part sent a telegram to the secretary general of the United Nations calling on the internationsl community to step up actions to eliminate the threat of war.

Of great significance has been the Moscow All-Union Conference of Scientists for Mankind's Deliverance From the Threat of Nuclear War and for Disarmament and Peace. Leading Soviet scientists and their prestigious colleagues from abroad spoke scientifically, conclusively, revealingly, and passionately about the brutal consequences for mankind of a nuclear war.

Contemporary science has opened up the broadest horizons for the activity of the human mind to people's benefit. But it has also effected a revolution in the means of warfare. A war employing nuclear missile weapons, modern aircraft, tanks, and guns threatens the lives not of hundreds of thousands of people, but the lives of many millions, the existence of human civilization itself.

As a duty dictated by their conscience, the scientists spoke of the need to designate with all clarity the source of the real threat of war. The truth is that, pinning their hopes on the blind force of arms, the aggressive circles of the United States and NATO are endeavoring to halt social progress and are counting on dictating the course of world development and suppressing the movement for social and national liberation. From the mouths of those same torchbearers of war issue insane appeals for a "crusade" against communism and threats to consign world socialism to the "dust-bin of history."

With the aid of plans nurtured in the bowels of NATO for the deployment of new nuclear missiles in West Europe, and with the aid of other militarist actions, the Washington administration is attempting to break the military parity which has taken shape and to achieve superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. Within the United States the doctrines of "limited," "protracted," "global," and other types of nuclear wars are being propagandized, and the "acceptability" of such carnage and the possibility of "coming out on top" are being substantiated.

Mankind is living through a crucial time -- the hand of the nuclear adventurists has only to pull the string and the ball will start to roll. The deployment of the U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles on West European soil which is so eagerly sought by Washington, exploiting the inconsistency and complicity of the leaders of a number of NATO states, can only exacerbate a precarious situation. It is still not too late today to erect a barrier to these dangerous plans.

It is the profound conviction of Soviet scientists -- and this was reflected in their Appeal to the Peoples of Science Throughout the World -- that there exists a solid, objective foundation on which the arms race can and must be halted and reversed. This foundation is represented by the prevailing strategic military balance. Common sense dictates that we strive not for the illusion of military superiority, not for suicide by means of a nuclear first strike, but for the consolidation of the approximate equality, for the mutual reduction of the level of this equality.

The alternative to nuclear catastrophe is formulated in the Prague Political Declaration. Of great importance is the proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the states of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The new Soviet peace initiatives are receiving the peoples' growing support. A real opportunity to solve the problem of the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe is provided by the USSR's proposal to reach agreement on equal nuclear potentials in Europe in terms both of delivery vehicles and warheads, and with consideration of the corresponding British and French devices. This would promote the strengthening of universal peace.

The human intellect protests against the danger of war, against the senseless squandering of our planet's wealth and resources on the manufacture of the instruments of death, on the preparation for nuclear catastrophe. The peoples believe that common sense will ultimately prevail. Success in this historic struggle between the forces of war and peace will not come about by itself. Historical experience teaches that peace is not something one begs for but something that has to be fought for and defended. The firm, invariable course of the CPSU and the Soviet state toward the preservation of peace and international cooperation and toward the curbing of the arms race is unanimously supported by our people and evokes the approval of all peace-loving forces of the planet.

SHALYGIN DISCUSSES RESUMPTION OF MBFR TALKS

LD201748 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 20 May 83

[Text] The talks on mutual reduction in troops and arms in central Europe have resumed in Vienna. Although the talks have been on since October 1973, our commentator Yuriy Shalygin says, no agreement has been reached. Of course, the problem under discussion is very complicated and it affects the interests of the security of many countries.

On the other hand, any problem, no matter how complicated, can be solved if the negotiators are sincerely interested in a solution acceptable to all. This is exactly the position the socialist countries hold, and if the NATO countries had taken a serious approach to the draft submitted by the socialist countries at the 2d month of the talks, the military contingents in the center of Europe would have been reduced by over 300,000 men already by 1977, and the arsenals would have become smaller. This would have been done on the basis of approximate balance of forces between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO. Without upsetting the parity, the cuts would have lessened the state of confrontation between the blocs. In short, the principles of reciprocity and the security of the sides agreed upon by representatives of the East and West still prior to the talks would have been observed.

The Soviet Union and its allies strictly follow these principles at the Vienna talks. They have proved by deeds that they are prepared for a realistic compromise. What is more, as a gesture of good will the Soviet Union has unilaterally withdrawn 20,000 troops with their equipment from the GDR.

And what about the other side? Officials in the West reason like this: Either the socialist countries accept inadequate bigger cuts as compared to the NATO countries, or there will be no agreement at all. The Western delegations have led the talks up a blind alley of fruitless discussions, trying in vain to prove that the socialist countries have more troops than they actually have. The West seeks to gain time to carry through the new militaristic programmes of NATO. The past years provide ample evidence of this.

It is significant that at the Soviet-American talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe, the Western side follows a similar line. Both at Geneva and at Vienna NATO seeks to break the parity of forces, to attain superiority to the detriment of the lawful interests of the security of the other side. In the process the West is slandering the socialist countries to drown the proposals of the Soviet Union and its allies in a torrent of lies about a Soviet threat.

One of these proposals provides for the conclusion of a treaty which would ban the use of force between the two blocs. Some people may argue that this proposal has nothing to do with the subject of talks either in Vienna or in Geneva. This is true. Yet the proposal is in fact directly connected with the talks since its aim is genuine military relaxation in Europe. And this in turn is what not only the Europeans but the people of other regions of the planet need. This is what is needed to ensure universal peace.

GDR JOURNALIST CITED ON LUNS' GENEVA TALKS STAND

LD212324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1815 GMT 21 May 83

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] NATO General Secretary Luns has called the Soviet Union's proposal to reach an agreement with NATO on equal nuclear potentials in Europe in both carriers and nuclear warheads inadequate, and has demanded new proposals. Luns' statement, (Reinhard Dohrst), GDR international affairs journalist, notes, does not sparkle with originality. Leading NATO politicians are constantly trying to delude the public, coming out with all kinds of possible fantasies in relation to the concrete and far-reaching initiatives on curtailing the nuclear danger in Europe which the Soviet Union has repeatedly advanced since the end of the seventies.

However, as is testified by Luns' utterances, this initiative is being turned down. Moreover, the NATO general secretary has once again fallen back on the assertion that at the Geneva talks the nuclear arms of Great Britain and France should not be taken into account. It is said that they supposedly possess independent status and are not subordinate to NATO. In this way, in all seriousness, they are demanding that the Soviet Union and its allies take no notice of more than 4,000 warheads, each of which is dozens and even hundreds of times more powerful than the atomic bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. One thing is absolutely clear to anyone who might be in charge of this weaponry -- it is situated in the NATO zone and it is directed against the USSR and other participant states of the Warsaw Treaty. Therefore, they must be taken into account in military ratios, and people in the GDR are firmly convinced of this. This week, talks were resumed in Geneva between the USSR and the United States; the statement by the NATO general secretary, therefore, cannot but cause anxiety. It shows that U.S. and NATO ruling circles, for the sake of the wish for military supremacy, want to deploy new nuclear missiles in West Europe at any price. This position is fraught with enormous dangers for the peoples of Europe. Therefore, in the struggle for constructive agreement in Geneva, (Reinhard Dohrst) stresses, every day is important.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD221756 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 22 May 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, international affairs journalist; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, all-union radio commentator on international affairs]

Scientists' Disarmament Conference

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrade radio listeners. An event of enormous international significance, precisely international significance, was the All-Union Conference of Scientists on Freeing Mankind From the Threat of Nuclear War, for Disarmament and Peace, which was held in Moscow. My point that this conference was of enormous international significance is not arbitrary...

[Bovin, interrupting] But many foreign guests also took part in it; along with Soviet scientists, scientists from many other countries were represented. Let us please note this at the start.

[Levin] Yes. The international significance of the conference is also determined by the importance of the problems that were discussed and the importance of the tasks. The scientists singled out the need to explain that the whole of mankind has elimination of a common enemy -- nuclear war -- as a primary task. It is necessary to fight this enemy with all available means.

[Bovin] Indeed, I sometimes think, even if this may not be a very strict line of reasoning, that after all it was the scientists who made the atom bomb. Therefore, they, as they say, hold the cards in their hands; it is their duty now to...

[Shishlin, interrupting] It was the scientists who created the atom bomb and gave it to the politicians. [laughter]

[Bovin] Yes, this is quite clear, but nevertheless it was created by scientists, and therefore, indeed, they should be among the first to speak out in the struggle against what has happened as a consequence. Generally speaking, this was the first time in the history of civilization that mankind created weapons capable of destroying mankind. It would even seem to me that this fact in itself should bring about some fundamental changes in our understanding of the situation, in our way of thinking and in our awareness of what is occurring. Regrettably, when seeing what is being written and said in different countries, the impression is created that people have not yet fully understood the fundamental change that has occurred, if you like, in the history of mankind. And therefore it is particularly important to keep explaining this and showing what all this may lead to.

[Shishlin] Perhaps, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, those scientists who take a more careful view of the capabilities of nuclear weapons and of all modern weapons as such are now probably more keenly aware of the consequences...

[Bovin, interrupting] Indeed, indeed...

[Shishlin]...which may follow if someone presses the button.

[Levin] I would like to note another fact. This conference of scientists, of Soviet scientists, was held at a very high level because more than 500 Soviet scientists were represented there, the names of many of whom are known the world over.

These are people of very high authority. Academician Ponomarev, candidate member of the Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the party Central Committee and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities -- a representative of the party and state leadership -- and Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev also took part in this conference.

In the West too there now is a group of generals, opposed to NATO military doctrine, who formed a group under the slogan Generals for Peace. Take for instance General (Bastian) from the FRG, who resigned in protest against the decision taken at the December NATO council session on deploying new nuclear missiles in West Europe.

[Bovin] He has now been elected to the Budestag on the Green Party list.

[Levin] Yes, and he has alredy taken part in debates there. His statements are, of course, of great authority in discussions concerning military problems, as he is a military expert.

Speaking at the conference however, Marshal of the Soviet Union Akromeyev did not enter into dispute with the views of the scientists, but quite the contrary: we have united views. Comrade Akhromeyev demonstrated in great detail and very clearly that the objective of Soviet military doctrine is to ensure that things never come to either a first or a second strike, that there should never be a nuclear war at all. Our approach to these issues has been formulated by Soviet leaders as follows: The Soviet Union's defense potential should be sufficient enough to deter anyone from venturing to disrupt our peaceful life. This is a course not toward superiority in arms but toward their reduction, toward the diminution of military confrontation -- this is our policy and our doctrine. Soviet sicentists support such a position; it is united as an integral whole.

[Shishlin] Victor Nikolayevich, the work of this conference of scientists had much in common with the points of view shared by many scientists in the West. You will remember, for instance, the appeal by a group of U.S. scientists to Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov and to leaders of other states. Incidentally, the only reply they received -- and they addressed themselves to Reagan and others -- was the reply from the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The issue raised was no more nor less than making space an area of peace, not allowing the deployment of weapons in space and not using space for military purposes. Therefore, it seems to me that in speaking of the international resonance of this all-union conference -- and this surely is just what it is -- I do not know how the work of this conference is being presented in the West now, but my impression is that the coverage of it is quite limited.

[Levin] The information agencies, the bourgeois information agencies, pretended that it never happened.

[Shishlin] Precisely. At the same time; it is of course a fact that the very orientation of the work, the way the problems were formulated at this conference and the approach to these problems; all converged with the views held by many scientists, and not just scientists -- you already mentioned a general.

[Bovin] There are two points in which, so to speak, the conclusions of this conference can be formulated: The occurrence of a thermonuclear war would be a general catastrophe for mankind, this is the first conclusion; the second conclusion is that it is necessary to do everything possible, and more than is possible, to prevent this from ever occurring. These are the two basic points, in my view. This is an appeal to the whole world, to all people and to the antiwar movement to intensify their activities now during this dangerous watershed period through which mankind is passing. It is necessary to work toward a gradual reduction in the level of armaments that still exist in the world.

For instance, the talks that began last Tuesday in Geneva are now one of the main places -- the talks on euroweapons, that is, on European medium-range weapons -- I would say that this is one of the main places where a struggle is now taking place, a struggle for detente and against the threat of nuclear war.

Geneva Talks, Euroweapons

[Levin] Indeed, all international politics seem to be pivoted on these talks; they are the center of attention.

[Bovin] Yes, yes, this is indeed the case.

[Shishlin] At the very beginning of the talks, commentators were stating that during the first 2 hours of talks the two sides did not exchange any statements. Possibly they need not be expected to exchange any statements. Possibly they need not be expected to exchange any statements immediately after the break, especially since statements were made prior to the resumption of the talks themselves. Statements were issued, most authoritative statements, both in Washington and in Moscow, but regrettably they were very different statements.

[Bovin] In general, the Americans retain a very inflexible stance. They would deny this if asked directly. However, it is my impression that they want to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe at all costs. Everything else is a question of tactics for them.

[Levin] THE NEW YORK TIMES reported that Nitze, head of the U.S. delegation at the medium-range nuclear missile reduction talks, stated on his arrival in Geneva that if the Soviet side demonstates flexibility and readiness it will be possible to achieve a solution in the interests of both West and East. Here no doubt, the fundamental difference in the positions lies....

[Bovin, interrupting] No, they talk about this flexibility, but the fact is that....

[Levin, continuing] The fact is that it is being shown.

[Bovin] In recent months Yuriy Vladimirovich made a whole range of proposals that meet the U.S. position half way, and they should have reacted to this in a positive way. After all, holding talks means, shall we say, that we must move to meet them half way, but the Americans must also move toward the meeting point. Only then we can come to an agreement. However, if we are moving forward along our half of the path while they are standing in one place repeating themselves over and over again about their zero option, or the intermediate option which in the end comes down to the zero option, how can there be a compromise, how can there be solutions? So far, regrettably, this is how the situation stands.

These are elementary things. Take, for instance, the French and British nuclear forces. It is absolutely simple. No matter how you turn things around, if you consider the situation in Europe it is necessary to take these forces into account. Incidentally, the British press writes about this quite often now. It is true that the French newspapers write rather less about this, but generally it is also being said that it is necessary somehow to take account of this potential. However, the Americans are stubbornly turning a deaf ear. They talk of various independent forces or strategic forces, but what ultimately is changed by such words and definitions? They are targeted on us. They can reach our territory -- this is for us the most central fact to which we cannot close our eyes.

[Shishlin] But then, looking at it from the other side, we have unilaterally undertaken the obligation not to deploy additional missiles of the kind called SS-20 in the West.

They said at first, and they are still feebly repeating this, that the USSR is allegedly continuing to deploy the SS-20. In fact they know perfectly well, however, that we are not deploying this type of nuclear missile on the European part of the country. At the same time, they themselves are doing just the opposite. As is known, the U.S. Administration is now, in essence, succeeding in twisting Congress' arm and obtaining allocations of $600 million for the production and deployment of the MX missile.

[Bovin] And this of course is a serious matter...

[Shishlin -- interrupting] Very serious.

[Bovin -- continuing] ...because it is an enormous missile, with 10 warheads. But I wanted to make this point: Naturally the French, let us say, and the British now find themselves in a very delicate situation because, let us consider this -- if our proposals were accepted and NATO and the Warsaw Pact forces were equalized at a certain level and then, since both the French and the British have very big modernization plans for their forces, if the French install new warheads and we install new ones in reply, and the British install some and we do the same in reply, the result would be that they become the initiators of an arms race in Europe and public indignation will be directed at them, and of course they do not want that. Therefore, they are trying, so to speak, to get out of this situation every way they can.

[Levin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, as I understand it they do not want public indignation, but neither do they want to renounce either their nuclear weapons or even the future development of them.

[Bovin] Quite right. Yes.

USSR Proposals, U.S. Stance

[Levin] That's where the root of the evil lies. And I'd like to return to this question. Concerning the USSR's flexibility, just recently we put forward the proposal for cutting back existing potential in terms of quantity -- if there are now, approximately, a thousand delivery vehicles on each side, to cut this to 300. We are prepared to adopt a pledge to have as many missiles as Britain and France now have, that is, 162 each. We are prepared to have the same number of delivery aircraft -- 138 each. This, too, is an important item in our proposals which is not to the West's liking since they want to take aircraft out of the equation altogether. Then they began saying the warhead numbers don't balance. On 3 May Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said: "All right, let's equalize warhead numbers too." That is to say, there must be equality in both delivery vehicles and in warheads. This is a very constructive proposal and a very far-reaching one. It has evoked a very broad echo in the world, an echo which cannot be ignored. But what sort of reaction has it produced? My attention was caught by one detail. From the circles, so to speak, of the U.S. delegation in Geneva there sometimes come certain reports which are, I would say, of a cautiously optimistic nature. For example, the FRG paper SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG wrote that the United States was supposedly approaching the negotiations with limited hopes for a speedy success. In other words, limited though they are, some hopes exist and not everything is so utterly bleak. However, in point of fact the U.S. stance is blocking these negotiations. It seems to me that under such conditions talk of hopes for success is camouflage, an attempt to beat down the wave of protest which is swelling...

[Bovin -- interrupting] That's what is called "making the best of a bad situation."

[Levin--continuing]... With extremely underhanded aims: to lull the public by suggesting that if there is hope of success, there is no need to protest against the plans and matters should be allowed to take their course in Geneva; and once again to cast a shadow over the truly constructive position of the USSR.

[Shishlin] Yes, but here there's another American objection. At issue are weapons with global capabilities and global limits. But if we try to penetrate the fog in some way then, strictly speaking, they want to talk about Soviet medium-range weapons which are deployed not only in the European part of the country but also in the Asian part. Moreover, they have no intention whatever of discussing American nuclear-missile capabilities of comparable destructive power stationed in Asia. This, of course, is a really serious matter because if one now tries to overload the little boat of the Geneva Euromissile talks -- which is only just staying afloat as things are -- with Asian weapons too, whether Soviet or American -- and different neighbors will also have to be considered -- then things will look fairly hopeless.

[Levin] Yes, of course. When complex problems are aggravated by additional problems, then this is not the path by which to seek solutions. This once again gives us grounds to conclude that the United States is showing no good will in Geneva and that no sincere desire is discernible on the part of the United States to move forward in their side of the negotiations, to cover their half of the distance about which you, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, were speaking. At the same time, this is not; of course, an easy situation for the Washington administration either. Not long ago the West German weekly VORWAERTS interviewed Paul Warnke, who used to be head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and who knows the subject very well. He was asked: How would you appraise, in a very general way, the Soviet position at Geneva?

He replied: I have formed the impression that Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov is striving to urge the United States on to serious talks. He himself is ready for these, if both sides show the appropriate will, of course. But the United States evinces no striving to conduct serious negotiations.

[Bovin] That is precisely why -- to return to the subject of the scientists' conference -- it is particularly important to mobilize the public now, in order to create some sort of forum which might spur the politicians toward a settlement of all the problems for which a settlement is not only urgent but, one might say, overdue.

[Shishlin] I would add to what has already been said here that of course what is required is nothing less than a new way of thinking, a new approach to these problems. It must be understood that the security of one state now depends on the security of its neighbors near and far. Hence the principle of equality and equal security for all sides. And this equality and equal security for all sides can and should be ensured at an immeasurably lower level than it is today. Then we shall indeed pass from a balance of terror to a balance guaranteed by trust and cooperation.

Williamsburg Summit

[Levin] The voice of the public is sounding increasingly louder and with increasingly more weight these days. In earlier programs we have already mentioned the fact that the seven leading capitalist countries are preparing for the Williamsburg summit, at which they will discuss their main economic problems above all, and all the indications are that they will discuss not only economic problems but other problems too.

[Bovin] Two main problems will be considered in all probability: an attempt to somehow stabilize the capitalist economy, the latest attempt, and the East-West problem [kompleks].

[Levin] Before we tackle this problem I would like to talk about public opinion. The Japanese paper ASAHI has published the result of an opinion poll conducted in Japan, the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands and Spain on the eve of this Williamsburg summit. According to the results of this research, in all these countries the majority supported a reduction of military allocations and an increase in spending on social security, medical education [as heard] and education. ASAHI points out that Western governments are increasing allocations for military requirements on the pretext of countering the USSR. However, the public in these states takes a negative attitude to the arms race, and a negative attitude not only on the financial but also the political plane.

However, it appears that efforts will be made at Williamsburg to stifle the peoples' voice in some way. They have plenty of problems of their own. Nonetheless there is such a voice, and in the final analysis it will have to be taken into consideration.

Here is just one curious detail which seems to me highly noteworthy, though only indirectly connected with the Williamsburg summit. The American magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT placed this report under the heading "Washington Whispers." British Prime Minister Thatcher has canceled her meeting with President Reagan in Washington before the conference of the leaders of the major Western countries at Williamsburg not because, as was officially reported, she will have to stay at home to conduct the campaign on the eve of the election set for 9 June, but simply because Thatcher's advisers have warned her that her close contact with Reagan, in the atmosphere of growing anti-American feeling in Britain -- and this atmosphere is produced by the missile plans -- could cost her votes.

[Shishlin] But I think that at Williamsburg it will be a question not so much of ensuring security, disarmament and arms control, as they put it in the West, as of economic problems themselves, for everyone now is trying to guess the extent to which the appearance of a revival in the Western economy is a prolonged thing or whether certain other factors will operate, which will again drag down the Western economy, the more so in view of the fact that the discussion of these problems will itself be carried out with due consideration for the sharp economic policy differences between the United States and the West Europeans and the Japanese. Over and above this there is also the voice of the developing countries. No doubt you have noted that Indira Gandhi, the Indian prime minister, has sent a special message to the participants in this forthcoming meeting in which she draws attention to the extremely difficult situation in which the developing states have found themselves and to the need to take into account those ideas which were put forward comparatively recently at the conference of the Nonaligned Movement in Delhi.

[Bovin] Evidently, the old story is going to repeat itself once again here. I believe this is already the ninth such meeting of the same seven heads of governments and states. On every occasion all kinds of fairly diffuse declarations are adopted and sometimes, even, declarations are not adopted. And no concrete solutions emerge to the concrete problems which concern everyone.

[Shishlin] No document is planned.

[Bovin] Indeed, the Americans really have set course toward an absolutely informal meeting. It will not be Mr Reagan and Madame Thatcher attending, it will be Ronnie and Maggie -- that is how they address each other -- but, of course, the problems themselves are very important, and I would like to stress the thought that quite apart from what they solve or fail to solve in concrete terms, this tendency, this attempt to

coordinate the policy of the major capitalist states is a realtively new and interesting tendency in the development of world capitalism. Moreover, it is within the framework of this tendency that one should, in my view, examine the activity of the trilateral commission about which you know, comrades. This is not a short-term but a long-term factor of present-day world development. It is an attempt, I repeat, to coordinate the policy of the chief capitalist powers. So far little is being gained from this.

[Shishlin] Perhaps, but perhaps, nevertheless, not everyone knows what the Trilateral Commission is, because there are so many of these commissions of all kinds that here we must bear in mind that we are dealing with the commission of representatives of business circles and former major political figures which....

[Bovin -- interrupting] Europe, America and Japan, that's what it's about, the three sides, yes, an unofficial forum which has issued serious reports. Moreover, the most recent meeting of the committee in Rome presented a very interesting report about disarmament issues in which Reagan's policy is criticized, in particular on the MX question. They say that this is an absolutely unnecessary and unjustified venture, so to speak, concerning these missiles. That is the view of the Trilateral Commission, in particular, on this point.

[Levin] Nevertheless, Reagan, following his old traditions -- and these traditions are made manifest quite clearly in all directions -- will no doubt try to twist arms in Williamsburg. This American striving to dictate its own will to everyone everywhere is indeed displayed everywhere; a lack of desire to take into consideration the opinion of others, to face the real situation, and it appears to me that the present American Administration places immediate achievements higher than long-term, durable solutions. And this point, it seems to me, was also shown in the agreement which has been imposed -- and there are grounds for saying imposed -- by the United States, and subsequently by Israel, upon Lebanon.

Lebanon 'Agreement'

[Shishlin] As far as this particular agreement is concerned, this is without a doubt a dubious coordinated line.

[Bovin] Of course, the idea was a simple one, in essence an attempt to pull out another Arab country, on this occasion Lebanon, from the anti-Israeli Arab front. But it must be said that the situation is a complex one, because the Government of Lebanon and its parliament have approved this agreement as has the Israeli Knesset. Egypt supports this agreement, and evidently other Arab countries also will support this agreement.

[Shishlin] Some.

[Bovin] Some, yes, but not so few, in any event. Those who are resolutely opposed to it include Libya which, I remember, has even recalled its ambassador from Lebanon; Syria is resolutely opposed, the Palestinians are resolutely opposed to the agreement because in general it infringes upon both the sovereignty of Lebanon itself and....

[Shishlin -- interrupting] But let us add to this the National Patriotic Forces.

[Bovin] Yes, of Lebanon, of Lebanon, yes. They have also opposed it.

[Levin] But overall the agreement effectively turns everything upside down. The aggressor, Israel, receives a reward for its bloody evil deeds.

[Bovin] And the Americans, so to speak, are not merely encouraging all this in every way -- this is what it is all about -- and for this reason they have effectively made the withdrawal of Israeli troops dependent upon control over the southern area of Lebanon and on the withdrawal of the Syrian troops who are there on totally different grounds.

[Levin] The fact is that Israeli troops will only depart after the Syrians depart.

[Bovin] And the Palestinians who are in the north.

[Levin] And the Palestinians. So this is a deed which is very far removed from a just settlement of the Near East problem although in Washington they say that this is a just agreement, that this is indeed the way to peace, whereas in fact this is undoubtedly not the road to peace but the road to war.

Dos Santos Visit 'Useful'

Another problem we should like to dwell upon today is the visit by Dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angolan-Labor Party and President of the Angolan People's Republic, to the Soviet Union.

[Shishlin] There was a great deal in the visit, without doubt. I think our comrades will have seen what our press has published, both about the talks which were held in Moscow and about the agreements which were concluded between the two countries. I think we should simply pick out just a few points. The first one is the fact that Angola, which is in a fairly difficult situation -- and it is the object of pressure from the Republic of South Africa, and from the United States, which takes advantage....

[Bovin -- interrupting] For the internal situation there is still not absolutely stable: Savimbi is still operating there, and is operating in an extremely active way.

[Shishlin] Angola, of course, in the present situation, needs real international support, and this international support is being provided to this country by the Soviet Union, and not only by the Soviet Union. On the other hand, it seems to me that during this visit the thought has come through sufficiently clearly that the Angolans and our country are deeply interested in seeing a radical improvement in the situation in the south of Africa. In fact, there is just one way toward this: granting independence to Namibia, ending subversive actions against Angola, establishing truly peaceful cooperation between African states, and making the Organization of African Unity more active. And I think that the agreement that was signed in Moscow on the establishment and development of cooperation between our Communist Party and the party which today heads the development of Angola along the socialist path is extremely useful. So it was a useful visit.

[Levin] This was also discussed at the regular CPSU Central Committee Politburo session at which the results of the talks in Moscow with Comrade dos Santos were discussed. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the document says, approved the results of the talks and confirmed the line of the CPSU and the Soviet state on the further development and strengthening of political, economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation between the two countries.

It was stressed during the discussion that the Soviet Union will continue to give support to the People's Republic of Angola in the defense of its sovereignty and revolutionary gains, to strengthen solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia and the other peoples of the African Continent against imperialism, colonialism, and racialism.

The time for our broadcast has come to the end. Thank you for your attention, esteemed comrades. All the very best.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD201923 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 20 May 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Yevgeniy Kachanov, foreign policy commentator for All-Union Radio, with Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Shishkin, TASS political observer; Igor Petrovich Belyayev, doctor of economic sciences; and Konstantin Ivanovich Semenov, candidate of historical sciences]

Arms Policy, Positions

[Excerpts] [Kachanov] In their letters many of our listeners express support for the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and the new peace initiatives put forward by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during the visit to Moscow by a GDR party and government delegation. As Ivan Alekseyevich (Savelyev), a listener in Moscow, notes in his letter, Comrade Andropov again showed in a clear and well-argued manner that the most vital requirement of the present day is solving an important task -- how to prevent a new round in the arms race, to prevent war. The replies by the leader of our party to questions put by DER SPIEGEL magazine also explain our state's position. Many authors of letters received during this month are imbued with readiness to do their utmost to uphold the cause of peace, so that the clear skies are never again blackened by the storm clouds of war. We showed these letters to Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Shishkin, a political observer for TASS, who is a regular participant in our program. Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, I would like to ask you to answer a question put by Tamara Grigoryeva, a listener in Voronezh, Postolotenko, a driver from Abakan, and Tatyana Mezentseva from Tomsk. In one form or another they ask: What is the reason for the dangerous turn in the international situation?

[Shishkin] The principal reason is the militarist and adventurist course of the most aggressive forces of imperialism, above all, U.S. imperialism. Ignoring the lessons of history and challenging the realities of the nuclear age, Washington's hawks have set themselves the goal of achieving military supremacy and using weapons to impose the kind of order on earth which suits them. Professor Cohen, the well-known U.S. expert on international affairs, says that the Reagan administration is striving to switch over to a strategy of waging nuclear war for the sake of the objective of destroying the Soviet Union as a world power. Hence, the professor stresses, the reluctance to agree on a limitation of strategic armaments. This means that the administration rejects nuclear parity by again commencing an unrealistic search for a way to secure supremacy.

[Kachanov] In this way, Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, the Reagan administration effectively rejects the possibility of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist systems and the need for peaceful competition between them. One feels this constitutes a special danger.

[Shishkin] These are very critical times. One need only pull a string and the ball will start rolling, as Comrade Andropov noted in his speech at the dinner in honor of the GDR party and state delegation. This is precisely the role which the deployment of U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles in West Europe could play. If, disregarding common sense, matters go as far as that, there will be an inevitable chain reaction. The USSR, the GDR and the other Warsaw Treaty member countries will be forced to take retaliatory measures.

[Kachanov] But why has the question of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles become so acute right now? What can one say about that, Gennadiy Arkadiyevich?

[Shishkin] In the first place, this is because of the objective situation in the military sphere and the characteristics of the new U.S. nuclear missiles. The fact is that they are capable of reaching a target deep in the Soviet Union and Warsaw Treaty countries within 6 to 7 minutes. It is quite obvious that Washington regards these weapons, first and foremost as first-strike weapons capable of neutralizing the possibility of retaliatory measures. Indeed, Washington is not concealing this. The United States and its allies are planning to deploy strategic armaments in Europe and not simply creating a counterweight to Soviet medium-range missiles by deploying similar Western missiles.

Second, only a few months remain until the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe, planned for the end of this year. Admittedly, under pressure from world public opinion and some of its allies, Washington was forced to agree to talks with the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of medium-range nuclear facilities in Europe. However, as the U.S. observer Kraft noted, prior to donning his diplomatic tophat, as they say, Reagan on several occasions ostentatiously tried on his cold war armor. One might add that he did not just try it on but did his utmost to prevent real progress at the Geneva talks and used the failure of the talks as an excuse to deploy U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe.

From the very beginning Reagan put forward the so-called zero option, under which the United States would refrain from deploying the new missiles in return for the destruction of all the Soviet Union's medium-range missiles in Europe. In essence, this would mean the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union. The Soviet missiles were first deployed in Europe in response to the U.S. creation of so-called forward-based facilities. These facilities consist of U.S. bombers carrying nuclear weapons based on aircraft carriers cruising off the shores of West Europe, and also the enormous quantity of tactical nuclear weapons concentrated on the European Continent. To these one should add the nuclear systems of Britain and France, which are NATO allies of the United States.

The insincerity and falsity of Reagan's so-called zero option became even more obvious when Washington responded with a deathly silence to the genuine zero option put forward by the Soviet Union, the proposal to conclude an agreement on abandoning all types of nuclear weapons designed to hit targets in Europe, both medium-range and tactical ones.

[Kachanov] But let us remember, Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, that in West Europe and, indeed, in the United States itself, people very quickly realized that Reagan's zero option was really unacceptable. And let us remember what happened after that.

[Shishkin] Under pressure from the growing anti-war movement and world public opinion, and also from some of its allies, Washington put forward the so-called interim option. It was formulated in a general outline and in very vague terms by President Reagan in his speech in Los Angeles on 31 March. We, he declared, are prepared to conclude a temporary agreement on a reduction in the deployment of missiles which we are planning, as long as the Soviet Union, for its part, reduces its corresponding warheads to the same level.

If you think about these words, it is not difficult to see that the interim option is no different from that self-same bogus zero option, which is designed to secure for the United States superiority over the Soviet Union.

Comrade Gromyko at his press conference in Moscow following Reagan's speech persuasively showed why this so-called interim option was unacceptable not only to the Soviet Union but also to all who cherish the cause of peace and the strengthening of security. In the first place it is unacceptable because it does not take into account the British and French medium-range nuclear systems, including 162 missiles. Second, it does not take into account the many hundreds of U.S. aircraft carrying nuclear weapons which are based in West Europe and on aircraft carriers. Third, Soviet medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union would have to be eliminated, although they have nothing whatsoever to do with Europe. All in all, whereas NATO now has a 50-percent advantage in medium-range nuclear warheads in Europe, it would have almost two and a half times as many warheads of this kind as the Soviet Union if the interim option were to be implemented.

Having rejected this option but wishing to break the deadlock, the Soviet Union put forward another option at Geneva. It proposed that agreement be reached on a radical reduction in medium-range nuclear systems in Europe. The Soviet Union proposed reducing the roughly 1,000 units of such systems which each side has now to 300 units. Moreover, our country expressed readiness to an arrangement by which we would be left with only 162 missiles as a result of the reductions; in other words, exactly the same number as NATO -- Britain and France -- now have. An equally low level -- 138 units each -- would apply to aircraft carrying nuclear weapons.

In response to this, voices began to be heard in the West saying that the implementation of this proposal would leave the Soviet Union with more nuclear warheads on its missiles. But these objections also turned out to be fanciful. In his speech on 3 May at the dinner in honor of the GDR party and state delegation Comrade Andropov declared: We are prepared to agree on equality of nuclear potentials in Europe, both in terms of carriers and in terms of warheads, so long, of course, as the corresponding armaments of Britain and France are counted. In other words, the Soviet Union does not want to have any more missiles or warheads on them than NATO has during any mutually-agreed period. If the number of warheads on the British and French missiles are reduced, the number of warheads on the Soviet medium-range missiles would be reduced by the same amount. The same approach would apply to the aviation systems of this class of weapon which are deployed in Europe. Thereby a rough equality between the Soviet Union and NATO would be maintained, both in terms of carriers of medium-range nuclear weapons -- i.e., missiles and planes -- and in terms of the number of warheads on them. What's more, this equality would be at a considerably lower level than at the present time.

All unprejudiced and competent specialists and observers stress that the implementation of Comrade Andropov's new proposal would lead to a situation in which there would be considerably fewer medium-range missiles and warheads on them in the European part of our country than before 1976 when the Soviet Union did not have the SS-20 missiles, with which Washington is trying to intimidate West Europe. It is clear that the implementation of this proposal would bring Europe considerably closer to complete liberation from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. The only person who can refuse to accept such a proposal is someone who wants at all costs to deploy new U.S. nuclear missiles in West Europe, thereby upsetting the present balance of forces both in Europe and on a global scale.

U.S. Policy in Turkey

I have in front of me a letter from one of our listeners asking about Turkey and what is happening there as well as about what the Turkish government policy is. We showed these letters to another constant participant in our program, Doctor of Economic Sciences Igor Petrovich Belyayev. Please, go ahead.

[Belyayev] These letters contain paragraphs concerning, in particular, everything that is bound up with Turkish-U.S. relations and with U.S. attempts to use Turkish territory in its far-reaching and ambitious military plans.

Some time ago we told our listeners what has happened in Turkey since 1980 when the military came to power after a coup. At that time we noted in particular that Turkish military expenditures were growing and there was a growth factor of nearly 50 or 60 percent -- here I mean direct growth. And then came the Reagan administration's decision to increase military aid to Turkey by 60 percent also, so that in 1984 it will be the largest military aid offered by Washington to any country in the so-called Third World.

In its message to Congress back in February the administration asked for $740 million in military aid for Turkey next year, whereas in the budget for 1983 it asked for $450 million. At the same time, U.S. economic aid to Turkey is being halved, although it is this economic aid that Turkey needs most. It is even reducing some debt payments, saying that its economy is in a terrible state, literally on the verge of a breakdown.

What do the Americans usually say when they refer to Turkey? They stress that Turkey is a member of NATO and therefore that is the reason for all the U.S. military dealings with Turkey. Basically, the Turkish Armed Forces will now be reequipped with modern weapons and -- most notably, I would say -- Turkey will now be adapted to meet the U.S. need for countries with an anti-Soviet tendency.

Meanwhile, official Turkish organs keep on soothing public opinion. But while preparations for accepting U.S. military aid in Turkey proceed, we in the Soviet Union, of course, are following most attentively all that is going on in Turkey. Turkey is our neighbor and we are not indifferent to whether there will be Pershing-II or cruise missiles on the very doorstep of our Transcaucasian republics.

Situation in Chad

[Kachanov] In his letter Comrade Troshkin from Chelyabinsk asks us to discuss the present situation in the Republic of Chad.

I will not tell you about all the fluctuations in this struggle. I shall merely recall that last summer the so-called armed forces of the north, headed by Hissein Habre, defeated the forces of the transitional National Union Government headed by President Goukouni Oueddei. Hissein Habre managed in a short time to establish control over most of Chad. In October he formally proclaimed himself president. Admittedly, Goukouni Oueddei has not laid down his arms yet. There have been reports that he has even set up a provisional government in the town of Bardai in the north of Chad, that he is gathering his supporters. We will not try to guess how the confrontation in Chad will end. The African press has frequently noted that this country, which occupies an important strategic position, has become the victim of a dirty game played by some Western powers, for whom it is advantageous to maintain tension in Central Africa.

The United States is gradually gathering Chad into its arms by taking advantage of the country's internal contradictions and economic backwardness. The newspaper THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR bluntly wrote recently that the United States would extract as much advantage as possible from the possible situation in Chad. Washington is already trying to turn Chad's territory into a bridgehead for subversive operations against neighboring African states, above all against Libya.

A month ago it became known that the current president, Hissein Habre, had given permission for the United States and Israel to build a large military base in the south of Chad, in the area of Sarh. As payment for this the Reagan administration has put a large consignment of weapons and a group of U.S. military advisers at Habre's disposal. Zaire and Sudan, countries which are openly conducting a pro-imperialist course in Africa, are giving the regime similar assistance, which is not economic by any stretch of the imagination. It is obvious that the involvement of the Republic of Chad in the area of neo-colonial adventures by the West will not help settle the internal problems of that country and directly contradicts the interests of the people of Chad.

FRG Developments

Many of our listeners are interested in FRG developments since the elections on 6 March. Today we are answering questions from Comrade Nikolay Mikhaylovich Bedoly from Chernigov Oblast, Levin from Saratov Oblast and Mikhail Antonovich Fedorov from the town of Novocherkasskoye. Comrades, we asked Semenov, candidate of historical sciences, to have a look at your letters. Please go ahead, Konstantin Ivanovich.

[Semenov] All three letters that we have in front of us, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, concern various aspects of the same problem -- Franz Josef Strauss, to be precise.

The first question concerns his political character. Franz Josef Strauss will be 70 in 2 years. He has a bad reputation both as a man and as a politician. He is reproached for being involved in scandals and dishonorable behavior and striving to reach the upper echelons of power at any price. Among all the fairly important political figures in the FRG Strauss has shown himself as the most reactionary and extreme conservative.

[Kachanov] Now let's turn to the second question. Konstantin Ivanovich, what is Bavaria? Levin, one of our listeners in the village of Chiganak in Saratov Oblast, wants to know.

In the last 10 years Bavaria has developed its industry at an accelerated rate. And now the world does not associate Bavaria so much with beer and people in shorts with suspenders, wearing green hats with tassels, as with cars, electrical goods and machine building.

And here is the third question. Comrade Bdeoly from the village of Semenov in Chernigov Oblast asks: Why has Strauss refused to take part in the Kohl government?

[Semenov] The West German press is united in the opinion that Strauss has outwitted himself here. During the coalition talks which preceded the creation of the current Bonn government Strauss tried to gain points by openly criticizing the political behavior of Helmut Kohl. First, he accused the leader of the Christian Democrats of not offering him, Strauss, the necessary support during the 1980 election campaign. At that time, you will recall, Strauss was a conservative candidate for the post of chancellor. But in this year's elections Kohl, in the opinion of Strauss, was playing a double game. I will quote the words of Strauss at the meeting: If the Christian Democrats had attacked Genscher's party as energeticaly as they attacked the Bavarian CSU, they would have received an absolute majority of votes on 6 March. Obviously, Strauss added sarcastically, Kohl did not want an absolute majority.

[Kachanov] But, Konstantin Ivanovich, these attacks which Strauss makes on the Free Democrats and their leader, Genscher, probably have some significance.

[Semenov] That is true. Immediately after the change of authority in Bonn, in autumn last year, Strauss gambled on gaining the jobs of foreign minister and deputy chancellor. He could get these jobs only if the Free Democrats did not get into the Bundestag at the elections. These calculations, as we know, were not justified. And that is the reason for the reproaches against Kohl.

It must be noted that Strauss' program on foreign policy questions which he put forward at the coalition talks -- it is published by the weekly QUICK -- is really a program for unequivocal obedience to the United States, a program for arming West Germany and a program of shameless revanchism. At this level, the nonparticipation of Strauss in the Bonn Cabinet really looks like a definite rejection of the greatest extremes in that country's foreign policy positions.

SCIENTISTS' DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE CONCLUDES

Academy Vice President Speaks

LD181343 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 18 May 83

["A Threat to Our Civilisation" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 18 TASS -- "Human society has experienced all sorts of calamities. But never have they threatened the very existence of our civilisation", said Vice President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Academician Petr Fedoseyev. He spoke at a confernece of Soviet scientists devoted to problems of nuclear disarmament and peace.

The scientist stressed that people in different countries are realising more and more the danger of nuclear arms, the danger of a possible clash involving the use of these weapons. "The unprecedented scope of the mass anti-war movement, which is drawing into its orbit ever broader sections of the public, people of most diverse beliefs and views, confirms this," he noted. Today more and more people understand that for the first time in history there has been created a threat not of a local but of a global scale. The scale of the whole of mankind. And this threat is posed by the possible nuclear conflict, by the very fact of the tremendous build up of nuclear potentials.

Speaking of the policy of the imperialist circles of the West, Academician Fedoseyev stressed that their intent to achieve nuclear superiority over the USSR at all cost disorganises the entire mechanism of settling outstanding international issues.

The normal functioning of this mechanism presupposes political common sense, the search for mutually acceptable solutions and accords, he said. But the positions of some Western powers, for instance on the problem of nuclear arms in Europe, not only rule out such an accord but often are deprived of elementary common sense. How, for instance, is it possible to find any reasonable foundation for the refusal to count the British and French missiles in the overall balance of nuclear forces of the opposing military groupings? Why is it that in Europe not these nuclear weapons but only the deployment of American missiles should be taken into account when a comparison is made with the nuclear weapons of the Warsaw Treaty? It looks like the hypnosis of "nuclear might" is forming in some leaders a totally irrational, absurd approach to foreign policy problems.

Damage to Nature

LD181301 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 18 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 18 TASS -- "Nuclear war is a war not only against mankind but also against nature, the environment, which will suffer irreparable damage as a result of a

nuclear conflict," it was said in the report made by Academician Aleksandr Obukhov and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Georgiy Golitsyn at the all-union conference of scientists on problems of peace, that opened here on Tuesday.

The almost total destruction of the stratospheric ozone, huge forest fires, storms, smoke pollution of the atmosphere resulting in lengthy droughts on large territories -- this is only a part of what may happen as a result of a nuclear conflict, the report says.

The scientists mentioned also the biological aspects of the lessening of ozone as a result of nuclear blasts. The disappearance of ozone may lead to a greater exposure of the earth to ultraviolet solar radiation and this will cause a drastic increase in the number of cancer diseases.

PRAVDA Sums Up Conference

PM201142 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Responsibility for the Future of the Planet"]

[Text] Scientists hold a unique place in the ranks of the world pupblic movement to avert the threat of nuclear war. Millions of people heed their authoritative opinion on the danger threatening all mankind and the entire planet. For 3 days their weighty words of warning have been heard from the rostrum of the all-union conference of scientists which ended work in Moscow 19 May. About 50 foreign scientists participated in this forum's work along with Soviet scientists. They included representatives of international organizations and leaders of the Pugwash Movement.

Academician N.S. Borisevich, president of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences, delivered a review of the successes of the mass movement in the world to curb the nuclear arms race. He stressed that in terms of scale, character, socioprofessional and party political composition and the role played in it by the scientific intelligentsia, the contemporary stage of the antiwar movement is marked by a particular breadth. The year 1983 is particularly important in the struggle against the nuclear arms race, the scientist recalled. The date for the deployment of new nuclear missiles in a number of West European states is drawing near. We scientists must show an even greater unity of ranks in our antiwar movement for the elimination of the nuclear threat hanging over the world.

Academician L. Pal, secretary general of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, spoke on the contradictions between scientific and technical progress and nuclear weapons.

Prof D. Hodgekin, (Britain), president of the Pugwash Movement and Nobel Prize winner, took the rostrum. We are living through a very difficult time now, she stressed. But it is a time not just of anxiety but of hope, because millions of ordinary people throughout the world are making tremendous efforts to prevent nuclear war.

The United States has been engaged with particular energy recently in the creation and production of new types and systems of weapons, Academician A.V. Fokin said in his speech. Among those weapons a particular role is assigned to the creation of new types of chemical weapons and the organization of large-scale chemical weapon production. To justify the plans for the preparation for chemical warfare, the U.S. propaganda machine is systematically launching slanderous fabrications on the USSR's involvement in the alleged use of chemical weapons in Laos, Kampuchea, and Afghanistan.

The Soviet side, the scientist recalled, has more than once made well-argued statements on the flimsiness of such fabrications. UN special commissions and many Western scientists have made statements on the falseness and groundlessness of these accusations.

The Soviet Union's position on the chemical weapons question is clear and constructive. The Soviet Union has advocated and continues to advocate consistently that these weapons be outlawed.

Academician M.S. Markov, chairman of the Soviet Pugwash Committee, delivered a report entitled "Science and the Responsibility of Scientists." The responsibility of scientists today, he stated, consists in convincing public opinion of the falsity and, above all, of the deadly danger to mankind of the arms race as an alleged peace-keeping factor. One source which has kept such ideas alive has been the difficulties involved in implementing specific moves toward disarmament. And the myth of the USSR's military superiority threatening America has served for many years now as the standard method of intensifying the arms race. That myth is always resurrected in the United States before a new twist to the arms race.

More than anyone else, scientists are able to investigate the present situation and to evaluate objectively the Soviet Union's many peace proposals. Unfortunately, the speaker stated, there is a tragic side to the history of the world powers' attitude to Soviet peace proposals. It is well known that before World War II the Soviet Union put forward a number of proposals which could have barred the way to Hitler's aggression and considerably changed the course of history. Ignoring the Soviet proposals cost the world more than 50 million lives. I should like to call to mind the great degree of objectivity in the assessment of those Soviet peace efforts by the great physicist A. Einstein, one of the most active fighters for peace, whose ideas were different from ours but who paid due tribute to the Soviet Union's international peace efforts. He wrote: We should stress the fact that the Russian Government has worked more honestly and unambiguously than any other great power to promote international security.

And now history is repeating itself, the scientist stressed. The numerous Soviet proposals have been ignored or have not been discussed with the objectivity worthy of proposals whose noble aim is to prevent the impending world catastrophe. But it is no longer a question of millions of lives but perhaps of the total extinction of life on earth.

The arms race is accompanied by a ballyhoo about the so-called "communist threat," on which Einstein also had something to say that remains topical to this day: How long must we endure power-hungry politicians who try to generate fear of communism in an attempt to earn political dividends?

Society must be aware, M.A. Markov said in conclusion, of what science could achieve were it to have at its disposal the facilities and resources now being spent on arms. Serious research conducted in different countries has shown that the ending of the arms race and the conversion of military to civilian industry would substantially increase the number of jobs -- to a considerable extent the solution of the unemployment problem should be seen from that perspective.

Military detente would make available vast material resources which the peoples need so much. Enormous potential would arise for improving living conditions for all the peoples. With a full sense of responsibility, we scientists can say to the peoples that under conditions of world peace science can guarantee full employment for all able-bodied individuals, achieve major successes in the solution of the problem of the world's environment and the energy problem and make a decisive contribution to ridding the world of the food shortage.

Academician A.A. Logunov, rector of the Moscow State University and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, spoke of the need to raise young people in a spirit of implacability to war.

It is the duty of scientists in all countries, he said, to act in such a way as to ensure that the universities of our world always serve the noble cause of peace, and that they nurture in students a precise and clear understanding of the fact that thermonuclear war threatens civilization's very existence, and that the nuclear arms race involves innumerable disasters for all people of the world. University scientists would be fulfilling their duty if their students became not simply good specialists but also convinced supporters of peace, active opponents of militarist actions, and honest and sincere people ready to everything in their power to ensure that the earth always lies under a peaceful sky, a sky which never sees the flashes of war or thermonuclear explosions.

Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Space Reserach Institute, spoke. By the laws of nature, space would seem predestined for joint use by the world community, he said. The many communications satellites, meteorological satellite systems, and apparatuses studying the earth's natural resources are already reliably serving mankind. The extensive use of satellite systems to safeguard maritime shipping and navigation is beginning. All this is gratifying, but recently the grave threat has emerged of the transformation of space into an arena of the arms race. At the 36th UN General Assembly session, our country put forward a relatively simple and reliable formula which, as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov has noted, would provide a reliable barrier against attempts to militarize space. It is a perfectly clear formula: to ban all use of space for military purposes.

Prof D. Frei (Switzerland) spoke of the risk of the accidental occurrence of nuclear war. This factor must not be underestimated, he stressed. He listed a package of measures which could reduce the possibility of a surprise nuclear catastrophe. The main guarantee, however, is complete and universal disarmament and the establishment of a procedure which would provide an effective system for the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The majority of those participating in the conference, L. Rakic, dean of Belgrade University Medical Faculty, stated in his speech, either took part in or witnessed World War II, the most terrible war in history. I represent here a country which came next after the Soviet Union in terms of losses of human life as a percentage of the population. I firmly support the struggle to curb the arms race and to free mankind of the threat of a new war, not only in my mind as a scientist but in my heart as a man. In comparison with such a war and its consequences, World War II, which previously seemed hideous to us, can now only appear a small international conflict.

(L. Bota), (Switzerland), director of the UN Institute for Disarmament Problems (UNIDIP), expressed profound gratitude to the USSR Academy of Sciences for the opportunity of addressing the all-union antiwar conference of scientists. Scientists bear a special responsibility, he said, because it is they who by their authoritative words can answer many of the questions now being raised by billions of people concerned about the fate of peace. I personally am not fatalistic about the inevitability of nuclear war. The forces advocating security on the basis of total disarmament are constantly growing and will succeed in averting the catastrophe.

Press Conference Held

PM201446 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 May 83 Second Edition p 3

[A. Golts report: "In the Name of the Planet's Future"]

[Text] There is no task more important and urgent for the peoples and governments today than that of removing the threat of nuclear war.

An important role in this noble cause belongs to scientists, to those whom the outstanding French physicist Joliot-Curie urged to become "pioneers of the great new army of peace," because scientists understand better than anyone else what modern war is like.

Awareness of a lofty duty to the peoples and the desire to help mankind find the way out of the complex and dangerous situation which it has encountered were the ideas which determined the entire work of the All-Union Conference of Scientists for Mankind's Deliverance from the Threat of Nuclear War, for Disarmament and Peace. These same thoughts imbued the appeal to all the world's scientists adopted by the conference participants.

A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists on 19 May was devoted to the results of the representative forum, in which more than 500 Soviet and foreign scientists participated. Academician A.P. Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and academicians P.N. Fedoseyev and Ye.P. Velikhov, vice presidents of the USSR Academy of Sciences, participated in the press conference.

The press conference participants' statements and replies to journalists' questions emphasized that the forum of the scientific public which has just ended made an important contribution to the peoples' struggle to avert the threat of nuclear war. The reports and the statements by its participants analyzed the serious consequences which could result from a nuclear war. The conference was a portentous landmark in the struggle of the planet's peace-loving forces against nuclear catastrophe.

As was emphasized at the press conference, eminent Soviet scientists voiced full support for the peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, which is based on a realistic and constructive program for preventing nuclear war. Note was taken of the vital importance of the Soviet proposals to freeze existing nuclear weapons arsenals and reduce them considerably on the basis of equality and identical security and to make progress toward real disarmament, right down to mankind's total deliverance from any weapons of mass destruction.

At the press conference well-reasoned criticism was leveled at the American leadership's desire to upset the military-strategic equilibrium which has taken shape in the world and to achieve military superiority over the USSR. The speakers pointed out that objective scientific analysis shows the danger to the planet's peoples of the latest American military concepts. The determination of Soviet scientists to continue making every effort in the name of 'saving mankind from the threat of nuclear war' was emphasized. The Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against Nuclear War, which was instituted by the conference, sets itself precisely this task.

Academy President Meets Press

LD191615 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT 19 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS -- The all-union conference of scientists on problems of peace, that has just ended here, reflected the deep concern of men of science with the growing threat of nuclear war, the President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Anatoliy Aleksandrov told a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists here today. Vice Presidents of the Academy of Sciences Academicians Yevgeniy Velikhov and Petr Fedoseyev also took part in the press conference.

All conditions exist, Academician Aleksandrov went on, for coordinating the efforts of men of science in various countries in solving the most important task facing mankind -- the task of averting nuclear war.

In this respect a useful contribution was made by the just ended conference, he said.

Replying to a question by a correspondent of the American NEWSWEEK magazine, Academician Aleksandrov said that the deployment of American medium-range nuclear-missile weapons in Europe would create a new strategic situation for the Soviet Union.

Replying to a question by a Finnish correspondent Academician Aleksandrov said that the plans of an anti-ballistic missile defence in outer space, proclaimed by the present American Administration, are fraught with serious danger. He recalled that in their time, the USSR and the USA had reached agreement on a mutual limitation of ABM systems. And a violation of this agreement would be extremely dangerous. In the long run the creation of a more powerful ABM increases the temptation to deliver the first strike.

Speaking of the importance of the active participation in the conference of scientists from a number of foreign countries, Academician Petr Fedoseyev stressed: A very important and substantial comparison of viewpoints, viewpoints of men of science, took place.

Despite certain differences it can be said that scientists are seriously concerned with the present situation and in their overwhelming majority are prepared actively to resist the threat of nuclear war. There does not exist yet any united organisation of scientists against nuclear war. But most diverse movements and organisations are showing readiness to cooperate in this important undertaking. The Soviet committee of scientists in defence of peace, against nuclear war, which was set up at the conference is called upon to give organised forms to the increased activity of men of science in the Soviet Union, to their striving to take part in the solution of such a pressing problem of our time as prevention of nuclear war. Academician Fedoseyev noted that the documents adopted at the conference will be brought to the notice of broad sections of the world public.

In conclusion of the press conference Academician Aleksandrov stressed the important role of the mass media in disseminating truth about the serious danger of nuclear war overhanging mankind. He also noted the big importance of the forthcoming world assembly of peace champions in Prague.

Scientists' Appeal

PM231039 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 83 First Edition p 4

["Text" of an appeal adopted 19 May at Moscow All-Union Conference of Scientists for Saving Mankind From the Threat of Nuclear War and for Disarmament and Peace]

[Text] We Soviet scientists are making this appeal to men of science throughout the world. We are compelled to do so by the disquieting situation in the world. Our professional knowledge enables us to state with full responsibility that the destructive potential of the nuclear weapons stockpiled in the world is close to the critical level and it keeps growing as a result of the escalating arms race.

All the losses and horrors of the bloody wars in mankind's history, including two world wars, would pale before the consequences of a global nuclear conflict. The total amount of explosives used in all wars is less than 10 megatons, whereas the world today has in its nuclear arsenals weapons with an aggregate yield of more than 50,000 megatons. However, quantity is not enough to measure the colossal might of the modern weapons of mass destruction. There is a qualitatively new, truly global threat. The existence of human civilization and, maybe, life on earth is at stake.

We are firmly convinced that the most urgent need for mankind today is to preserve peace. No task is more important or urgent for the peoples and governments today than that of warding off the threat of destruction as a result of nuclear war.

To accomplish this task of truly universal significance the masses and all people of good will should first of all fully realize the nature and scope of imminent danger and clearly see the sources of military threat, and that all peace-loving forces on our planet should pool their efforts. Scientists have an important part to play in promoting this noble cause. By their knowledge, experience and authority they must actively promote the peoples' struggle for saving the world from nuclear destruction.

Soviet scientists have always been in the forefront of the struggle for peace. Guided by the principles of active humanism, they tell the harsh truth about the threat of nuclear war, "limited" or global, quick or protracted. They strongly condemn those who create this threat -- the militarist imperialist forces, especially in the United States, which are ready to plunge humankind into an abyss of nuclear catastrophe in a bid to further their hegemonistic interests. Soviet scientists express solidarity with their colleagues throughout the world who protest against the crime planned against humankind and defend reason against nuclear madness.

Soviet scientists enthusiastically support the peaceful policy pursued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state. The centerpiece of this policy is a constructive and realistic program for the prevention of nuclear war. They also give their unconditional support to the Soviet Union's commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and call on the other nuclear powers to follow the Soviet example. Vitally important are the Soviet proposals on freezing nuclear arsenals, substantially reducing them on the basis of equality and equal security and bringing about genuine disarmament to rid the world from any weapons of mass destruction and to ensure general and complete disarmament.

We are deeply convinced that there exists a firm and objective basis on which the arms, race can and must be stopped and reversed -- that is, the prevailing military and strategic balance in the world. Commonsense prompts men not to seek to achieve military superiority and the suicidal ability to deliver a first nuclear strike but rather to consolidate approximate parity achieved and consistently seek to lower its level on a reciprocal basis. One should think not about protection against nuclear weapons, but about their limitation, reduction and destruction. Soviet scientists therefore support Yuriy Andropov's proposal about a meeting with American scientists to discuss possible implication of the deployment of a large-scale anti-missile defense system planned by the U.S. Administration. An unbiased scientific analysis will undoubtedly reveal the futility and danger of the latest American concept.

The planned deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe may upset the current balance and provoke a qualitatively new arms race fraught with unpredictable consequences for international security. This dangerous course of events must be halted before it is too late. The Geneva negotiations on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe can and must produce a fair agreement, provided the American side heeds the peoples' demands and revises its unrealistic proposals which block a mutually acceptable solution to the problem of great importance for the future of Europe and the world as a whole.

We believe that the task of delivering mankind from the burden of armaments is a realistic objective. We are convinced that an end to the senseless wasting of efforts and resources, and the conversaion of the vast industrial, scientific and technological potential to peaceful uses will open up broad opportunities for the creation of material benefits and the betterment of quality of people's life.

We well realize the fruitful effects which disarmament may produce for clearing the international atmosphere from fear and suspicion, for the development of fruitful international cooperation and the cooperative efforts to solve the global problems of

our time such as combating hunger and disease, for satisfying man's needs for food, energy and raw materials, for the protection of the environment, and for the assimilation of the resources of the world's oceans and outer space.

We appeal to the scientists of the whole world to join their forces in order to protect universal peace, the common possession of all men, from the threat of nuclear destruction. The forces that make for peace are stronger than those that make for war. If they are all set at work, they will be able to put up an insurmountable obstacle to the aggressive forces and ensure lasting peace for the peoples.

The collective intellect and the united effort of mankind can and must halt the dangerous escalation of the threat of nuclear war. Nuclear catastrophe can and must be averted!

IZVESTIYA Cites Participants

PM221941 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 83 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by special correspondents V. Kondrashov and V. Mikheyev: "Scientists' Sacred Duty"]

[Excerpts] Concern for the fate of peace on our planet and confidence in the possibility of a victory by the forces of peace over Western militarist reaction headed by Washington -- that is the feeling which defines the atmosphere reigning at the All-Union Conference of Scientists to Save Mankind from the Threat of Nuclear War and for Disarmament and Peace.

On 19 May the participants in the conference and foreign guests laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In the break between sessions IZVESTIYA correspondents met with some of the participants and guests of the Moscow forum. Here are their statements:

V.S. Yemelyanov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: The most important element in the struggle for peace and disarmament is the mass upsurge taking place everywhere among the public, who are resolutely opposing imperialist circles' nuclear adverturism. This is a mighty force under present conditions. Viewing from this angle tne present all-union conference, from whose rostrum foreign guests have also spoken, we should note the great importance of dialogue between scientists. This makes it possible, in particular, to break down the artificially erected walls of distrust. The importance of contacts between scientists is also great because they are people with specialized knowledge, especially in the sphere of the natural and social sciences. The conference has enabled many foreign scientists to state out loud their position with respect to the most burning problem of the present day -- the problem of the defense of peace. Those taking part in the meeting in Moscow are citing many convincing arguments in favor of broad communication and cooperation between scientists with a view to eliminating the threat that is common to them all, which stems from bellicose circles of imperialism.

G. Montalenti, president of the National Academy of the Lincei (Italy): Scientists in the world play an important part in explaining to the public the prevailing international situation, which is marked by tension and confrontation. Our task is to mobilize public opinion and make it an effective force in the struggle for peace. All scientific workers, therefore, have a particular sort of responsibility. It is in this context that we should assess the conference taking place in Moscow. It will also help to enlighten those who still do not fully appreciate the danger of a nuclear conflict. However, it may be noted that recently the Western public has been becoming more informed on questions of security and disarmament. Taking into account existing NATO plans for deploying new "Eurostrategic" missiles on the continent, we must activate our efforts. Our academy's decision is framed in this spirit. The main thing is to exert effective influence on processes leading to genuine security via people's awareness, via public opinion.

REAGAN EXTOLS 'RABID MILITARISM' ON ARMED FORCES DAY

LD222317 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 22 May 83

[Text] Washington May 22 TASS -- The U.S. Government leaders used the observance of the Armed Forces Day in the USA for extolling rabid militarism and counting on brute force and unbridled build-up of armaments.

In a radio address to the nation President Ronald Reagan stated that in future as well he intends to follow the peace-through-strength policy. With the self-exposing straightforwardness the U.S. President stated that the USA should be prepared to use force, and successfully, too. With this end in view, according to him, it is necessary to have an impressive nuclear potential, in particular, the earliest implementation of the programmes announced by him for the creation and deployment of new "MX" multiple-warhead inter-continental ballistic missiles and "Midgetman" strategic missiles.

The same "ideas" were also in every way extolled by Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger in a speech at a ceremony to launch another U.S. nuclear-powered strike submarine in Norfolk (Virginia). Echoing the U.S. President he went to the lengths of saying that it is possible to prevent a war only by being always prepared to start it. At the same time, like Reagan, he did not find anything better to justify the unprecedented level of U.S. military expenditures, which in the coming five years alone will exceed 2,000,000 million dollars, than to resort once again to the trite insinuations about a mythical "threat from the East." Meanwhile, as is eloquently evidenced by facts, a threat to peace and international security emanates from the United States, which is straining after world domination and which makes dangerous attempts at achieving nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union by building up a first-strike strategic potential.

The launching of the new nuclear-powered submarine "Norfolk" which has cost the U.S. taxpayers 334 million dollars is an added proof of that.

As John Lehman, U.S. secretary of the Navy, has stated in San Francisco, with the Reagan administration's taking office the attitude towards the Navy has sharply changed for the better. He said the U.S. Navy develops rapidly. By 1989 the number of surface combatant ships will be brought up to 600. Twenty five new ships were launched last year alone, and another 110 are in production. The newspaper SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE points out in this connection that the hurried "modernisation" of the U.S. Navy by the Pentagon is aimed at achieving nuclear naval superiority over the USSR.

PRAVDA CITES TASS ON U.S. ARMS BUILDUP, PLANS

PM201047 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Looking at the Documents"]

[Text] New York, 19 May -- In one of his recent public statements, U.S. President Ronald Reagan said that from the year 1946 the United States "did not blackmail others with threats to use (nuclear) weapons, did not use its colossal might to conquer territory, to spread its influence or impose domination." In this way Reagan, in his own words, tried to "refute the allegation that the United States seeks superiority and that the United States creates a threat to peace" and to prove that it adheres to the cause of limiting nuclear weapons and "strengthening and preserving peace."

What has, however, been the actual state of affairs? Let us address ourselves to documents -- to the secret directives issued by the U.S. Administration between 1945 and 1960. Published for the first time now, the documents indicated that from the very start of the "nuclear age" Washington strove to assure for itself nuclear superiority with a view to engaging in nuclear blackmail of the whole world, was actively preparing for a nuclear war and had specifically reserved for itself the "right" to first use of nuclear weapons in order to deal a massive nuclear blow to the Soviet Union.

David Rosenberg, a scientist and historian from Houston University who obtained these documents, recounted their contents in the pages of the journal INTERNATIONAL SECURITY. He says that in keeping with the foundations for U.S. nuclear policy, laid by President Truman, "dealing the first nuclear strike to the Soviet Union" was proclaimed a "priority task" for the United States.

Already in 1945, he says, the Pentagon elaborated plans for "carrying out a most effective nuclear bombing" of the USSR. "By the fall of 1947," Rosenberg stresses, "U.S. strategists marked out a hundred cities in the USSR as targets for nuclear strikes," while in 1948 the U.S. Strategic Air Command presented its first operations plan under which the targets in Soviet territory to be subjected to atomic bombing were chosen with the principal aim of destroying the Soviet population and only indirectly the industrial centers."

In April 1950 the U.S. National Security Council worked out a special document called "NSC-68" which provided for unleashing a war against the USSR to put an end to communism "once and for all." In order to create the most favorable -- for the U.S. -- conditions for starting such a war, the document prescribed adopting the most energetic measures to enable the U.S. to preserve its nuclear monopoly or a significant superiority in nuclear arsenals.

The "build-up of U.S. nuclear potential," began under President Truman, was continued by subsequent U.S. administrations. Among other things, in the early fifties, President Eisenhower, in a memorandum to Secretary of State Dulles, cynically wrote to say that under certain circumstances the U.S. leadership "may be forced" to examine the question "whether our duty to the coming generations is to start a war at a time convenient for us." In 1955 the Pentagon demanded a doubling of the number of the strategic bombers -- then the chief delivery vehicles of nuclear weapons. A whole number of other secret directives were issued to sharply broaden the list of targets in Soviet territory which were, "in the event of necessity," to become targets for U.S. nuclear strikes.

Among other things, the Pentagon calculated that by 1960 the United States would need a minimum of 10,000 nuclear bombs in order to destroy all the "Soviet targets" marked by the Pentagon. "On the town of Minsk, an average Soviet city in terms of the size of its population," the author writes, "it was intended, for instance, to drop nine nuclear bombs at a time."

These are the facts. They show convincingly that U.S. ruling circles in fact do not seek peace, but make every effort to ensure the maximum buildup of their military -- above all, nuclear -- potential and to be in readiness to unleash a nuclear war. All the elements in this strategy are prominent under Reagan, who seeks to achieve U.S. military superiority over the Soviet Union and refuses to join the USSR in renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons.

PRAVDA SCORES U.S. 'IMPERIALIST' POLICY

PM190934 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 83 First Edition p 4

[A. Dzasokhov article: "Against the Imperialist Diktat"]

[Text] A little over 2 years ago, R. Reagan, having just taken over the office of U.S. President, called on his fellow countrymen overseas to "take up" the Stars and Strips. "It is not enough," he stated in that respect, "just to plant the flag in the soil and then go away.... We need an even greater presence on the ground."

The Washington administration, which does not hide the aggressiveness of its course, is gambling on hegemonism and diktat as is shown in U.S. foreign policy with regard to Asian, African and Latin American countries. At the same time it is subjecting the Nonaligned Movement to ever greater pressure.

The current U.S. Administration is abandoning the disguise of "partnership" and "cooperation" with the developing countries which its predecessors wore in the seventies. At that time, after the defeat in Indochina, U.S. policy was geared toward achieving a U.S. presence and setting in motion not so much its own Armed Forces as the armies of its allies, which were regarded under the so-called "Nixon Doctrine" as gendarme states.

Under President Carter, however, an updated action plan was proclaimed which emphasized the use of America's own forces. The present U.S. leadership has decided to go all out in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Reagan team clearly prefers a show of crude force to economic projects and diplomatic maneuvers.

This is the aim of the U.S. efforts to recruit new allies and clients and to involve them in its neocolonialist plans. Washington is trying equally diligently to split the developing states by using proimperialist regimes for that end, creating an atmosphere of confrontation and fueling tension in various parts of the world.

The Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact states noted that "old seats of tension are coming to life and new conflicts and crisis situations are flaring up. The peace-loving states' efforts to solve disputes -- on a world and regional scale -- by means of equitable talks among the interested parties are being blocked and an increasing number of unresolved international questions are building up. Imperialist circles are pursuing a policy of strength, pressure, diktat, interference in internal affairs an infringement of the national independence and sovereignty of states."

Washington is reacting with evern increasing aggressiveness to the progressive changes and transformation in the developing countries in the belief that they do not belong to its scenario of international life. Ignoring both individual human rights and the rights of whole peoples, the Washington strategists are rehearsing methods of conducting goon actions against the national liberation movements. That is the aim behind the creation of the interventionist "Rapid Deployment Forces" and a network of bases containing arms stockpiles, including nuclear arms. A "Central Command" (Centcom) has been created which has its sights on 19 Asian and African countries. Vast areas of Asia and Africa adjacent to the Persian Gulf have been declared the sphere of "U.S. vital interests." The United States is letting it be known unambiguously that it intends to nip in the bud any attempts by the countries both of those two continents and of Latin America to change the inequitable character of their relations with the West. New pretexts are being invented in addition to the hackneyed refrain of the "Soviet threat" to justify the "strong-arm" methods.

Attempts by imperialism and its assistants to switch to the counteroffensive against national liberation forces have been seen in a number of regions.

The Near East situation has become the object of general concern of national patriotic forces in the Arab countries and elsewhere. Many are asking: How are the lessons to be learned from what is happening there? And in that atmosphere the main conclusion arises that it is necessary to preserve and strengthen the unity of the national patriotic forces of the Arab states and peoples.

Alarming reports are coming from southern Africa. Racist South Africa, using the Israeli invasion of Lebanon as a "model" and relying on Washington's support, is harboring plans to strike blows against Angola and other independent states in that region. Delivering a speech in Moscow on 16 May, Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the MPLA-Labor Party and president of Angola, noted that imperialism's aim is to hinder social and economic development not only in Angola but also in the southern African countries as a whole and also to neutralize those countries' efforts to gain liberation from the racist regime's tutelage and achieve economic independence.

Imperialism is intensifying its pressure on the African countries. Where is the way out of the situation that has been created? African capitals are noting that positive results may be gained from the joint efforts of the countries of the African Continent itself with support from the progressive forces of the world, primarily the socialist community countries. The OAU -- the tried and tested mechanism of the coordinated anti-imperialist struggle -- remains the symbol and bulwark of such joint actions.

The United States is counting on drawing the Southeast Asian countries into the orbit of its military-political strategy by gambling on setting the ASEAN members against the three fraternal Indochinese states of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. On the pretext of strengthening ASEAN's "defense," the Americans are imposing a broad militarization program on the ASEAN countries and are urging them toward confrontation with the Indochina states.

U.S. ruling circles have long regarded the Central American region as their own private domain. Times have changed, however. Following heroic Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada have also gained their freedom. The flames of the struggle for national and social liberation have embraced El Salvador, Guatemala and a number of other countries.

Washington has switched to the counteroffensive against the forces of freedom, democracy and progress in that region, too. That counteroffensive has acquired a particular scale under the Reagan administration. While fanning the myth of a "communist conspiracy" in El Salvador and accusing Cuba and Nicaragua of giving military support to "terrorists" in the Central American countries, U.S. imperialism is exploiting that lie to sharply intensify its interference in the Caribbean states' internal affairs. The continuing invasions of Nicaragua by American mercenaries convincingly expose the methods that Washington intends to continue using.

The preparation of bridgeheads for delivering a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union is an important component of U.S. global plans in the developing countries. The areas turned into bridgeheads of that kind should serve, according to the Pentagon's scheme, as targets for retaliatory strikes, thereby diverting them from the United States. These criminal plans, in tandem with the open gamble by Washington and its allies on military strength, have led to the perceptible development and combination of the anti-imperialist and antiwar movements. As Indian Prime Minister I. Gandhi has noted, the Nonaligned Movement has now become a mass antiwar movement.

The bringing to the fore of the questions of war and peace which are common to all peoples and the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe are stirring the developing countries to consolidate their rank.

Public opinion in Asia, Africa and Latin America is more aware than ever before of its role in the struggle for the fate of the whole world and of all mankind. The peoples of those continents are setting themselves the dual task of helping to save mankind from the nuclear threat and clearing the way for socioeconomic development. They can see that imperialism, which is imposing conflicts and the arms race, would like to keep those countries in a subordinate position. Under those conditions, an objective process of rapprochement and coincidence of positions is observed between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and the positions of the young independent states. Thus the theory of the developing states' "equidistance" from the socialist countries and the West is refuted by reality.

Here is an extract from the message from the seventh conference of nonaligned countries in Delhi: "The central problems of our time are peace, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, and development. However, peace must be based on justice and equality since the intolerable inequality and exploitation established by colonialism and imperialism remain the main sources of tension, conflict, and coercion in the world."

The conference of secretaries of the socialist countries' communist and workers parties' central committees held in Moscow welcomed the results of the Delhi conference. But they provoked a completely opposite reaction in Washington, where they were angrily attacked. The U.S. stance set out by the State Department contained clear slander and a flagrant distortion of the documents approved by the Delhi forum. In addition, Washington accused the Nonaligned Movement members of "unscrupulousness" (in comparison with the U.S. Administration's concepts, of course) and took it into its head to instruct the representatives of 2.5 billion people in the "principles of nonalignement" as it sees them.

It is now becoming clearer than ever before that the success of peace initiatives and the implementation of mankind's bright ideals depend greatly on the cohesion of the forces of peace, national liberation and social progress and the purposefulness of their actions. This idea is finding an increasing number of supporters and followers in the Asian, African and Latin American countries. That is why the coincidence of positions and aims between the nonaligned states and the socialist community countries and their joint or parallel actions on the cardinal problems of the present day in the struggle for peace and the security of the peoples, for the ending of the arms race and disarmament, for full and comprehensive decolonization, for the restructuring of international economic relations on just democratic principles, and for socioeconomic progress are of such great importance.

IZVESTIYA NOTES U.S. CHURCHES' ANTINUCLEAR PROTEST

PM181552 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 83 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Against the U.S. Administration's Plans"]

[Text] The National Council of Churches has made a resolute protest against the whipping up of the nuclear arms race by Washington. This major U.S. interdenominational organization represents 40 million Protestant and Orthodox believers, TASS reports.

A resolution approved at the San Francisco conference of the council's leading body sharply condemns the Pentagon's insane military doctrines.

The document stresses that the very idea of the possible first use of nuclear weapons and permissibility of nuclear war, either "protracted" or "limited," is amoral. The National Council of Churches came out in support of the U.S. National Conference of Catholic Bishops' pastoral message, which contains an urgent appeal to curb the arms race and reach agreement on halting the testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons systems.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the resolution, which rejects Washington's militarist course, was approved in San Francisco in spite of very powerful pressure exerted on the National Council of Churches by officials and certain press organs, which share the insane views of advocates of accelerated war preparations.

The San Francisco conference participants made an appeal to support and take an active part in the planned 27 August march to Washington demanding peace and jobs. The council also adopted a resolution sharply criticizing the R. Reagan administration's policy in Latin America. The document contains a demand to end U.S. interference in the affairs of El Salvador and Nicaragua.

The decisions adopted by the leaders of the U.S. Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox communities are evidence of the growing isolation in the country of the current Republican administration, whose policy on the most important questions of war and peace, nuclear policy and strategy is meeting growing condemnation and opposition among the American public.

As has already been reported, the R. Reagan administration has suffered a defeat in the U.S. House of Representatives, where a resolution was adopted appealing for a mutual and verifiable freeze on and reduction of U.S. and USSR nuclear armaments.

MOSCOW ON NEW U.S. 'SECRET SERVICE' ORGANIZATION

LD122224 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 12 May 83

[Text] A new organization has been set up in the United States in addition to the secret services engaged in sabotage activities all over the world. More form our observer, Viktor Olin, and this is what he writes:

The first press leaks about the new organization appeared last March in connection with a scandal over U.S. subversive activities against Kampuchea and Laos. The congressmen looking into the matter were puzzled to learn there was another secret service active in various parts of the wrold — the Army Intelligence Support Activity, the ISA. It was established back in 1980 within the Defense Department. From the very start, the ISA was given a privileged status over the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency, the DIA, already in operation within the Pentagon.

The target of the new secret service was the countries of Indochina, Iran, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and other countries. Its agents were employed not only to collect intelligence information. They did not stop at direct interference in developments in this or that region by supplying all kinds of subversive organizations with arms and money and being personally involved in acts of subversion and other clandestine operations. According to some reports, the main forces of the ISA are now engaged in Central America.

There are indications that the Pentagon's secret service is a nucleus of sorts for a mammoth organization in the making. The activity of that organization will be much broader than that of the CIA and the DIA.

Circumstantial plans to this effect have been drawn up by retired General Richard G. Stilwell, a deputy under secretary of defense in charge of intelligence and secret operations. Even a name has been thought up for the future super agency -- Monarch-Eagle.

These plans fit snugly into an overall military and political program outlined by the Reagan administration for the years to come. The authors of this program proceed from the assumption that combat operations planned for any part of the world viewed as a zone vital for American interests must be prepared and backed up by a ramified intelligence network operative on a permanent basis. That enhances the threat to the internal stability and government of developing nations, especially those of them that won independence relatively not so long ago. National liberation movements and their leaders as well as antiwar champions are the prime target. Consequently, the Reagan administration is out to make espionage, terror, and sabotage a basic instrument of its policy. The new secret service of the Pentagon is in the first ranks of those who are to tackle the job.

Mikheyev Remarks

LD191105 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1835 GMT 18 May 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Viktor Mikheyev]

[Text] Now let us move on to the Pentagon's secret subunits. It has come to light that the U.S. Defense Department has set up a special new secret subunit for gathering intelligence and carrying out secret operations. This is in addition to the existing Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence agency of the Defense Department. This new subunit for secret operations is to operate throughout the world. It has currently been entrusted with operations in El Salvador and against Nicaragua. Its existence has been confirmed by a spokesman for the U.S. Defense Department. The explanation is that the Pentagon is apparently unhappy with the intelligence it received from the CIA. THE NEW YORK TIMES has written that the special subunit was so extremely secret that even the CIA and the Defense Department intelligence agency had only a very rough idea about it.

TASS REPORTS TURNER 'REVELATIONS' OF CIA PLANS

LD130530 Moscow TASS in English 2006 GMT 12 May 83

[Text] Washington May 12 TASS -- Late in the seventies, early in the eighties the CIA worked out the plans to overthrow Cuba's leader Fidel Castro, Libyan leader Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, the new Nicaraguan Government, Ayatollah Khomeyni in Iran. Reporters were told about these sinister designs of the CIA by former director of the United States Central Intelligence Agency Stansfield Turner. These plans remained unfulfilled because of the fact that the "cloak and dagger boys," as Turner admitted, have not succeeded in finding the "practical ways" for this.

Even before Turner's revelations it was well known that in the sixties the CIA attempted to make short work of Castro and late in the seventies it tried to liquidate Khomeyni. But the later plots against the Cuban leader, or the conspiracy against Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, were never admitted in Washington before. Turner's pronouncements are even more eloquent since they come from the lips of a man who is in the position to know the CIA's secret plans.

FURTHER UNUSUAL REPORTS ON AFGHANISTAN AIRED

Tribes Fight 'Soviet Invaders'

LD231310 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 23 May 83

[Read by Vladimir Danchev]

[Text] The population of Afghanistan plays an increasing role in defending the country's territory against occupants [as heard]. Reports in Kabul say that tribes living in the eastern provinces of Nangarhar and Paktia have joined the struggle against the Soviet invaders [as heard]. A decision to give an armed rebuff to the bandits was taken at the tribes' meeting. The participants underlined that the activity carried out from Soviet territory [as heard] endangers the security of the population of Afghanistan.

Later Broadcast Altered

LD231302 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 23 May 83

[Read by Vladimir Danchev]

[Text] The population of Afghanistan plays an increasing role in defending the country's territory against Soviet occupants [as heard]. Reports in Kabul say that tribes living in the eastern provinces of Nangarhar and Paktia have joined the struggle against the counterrevolutionaries. A decision to give an armed rebuff to the bandits was taken at the tribes' meeting. The participants underlined that the activity carried out from Soviet territory [as heard] endangers the security of the population of Afghanistan.

[At 1300 GMT Danchev read the following version of this report: "The population of Afghanistan plays an increasing role in defending the country's territory against bands infiltrated from the Soviet Union [as heard]. Reports in Kabul say that tribes living in the eastern provinces Nangarhar and Paktia have jointed the struggle against the Soviet invaders [as heard]. A decision to give an armed rebuff to the bandits was taken at the tribes' meetings. The participants underlined that antigovernment activity carried out from the Soviet territory [as heard] endangers the security of the population of Afghanistan."]

Report by Different Newscaster

LD231430 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 23 May 83

[Read by Vladimir Obratson]

[Text] The population of Afghanistan plays an increasing role in defending the country's territory against bands infiltrated from Pakistan. Reports in Kabul say that tribes living in the eastern provinces Nangarhar and Paktia have joined the struggle against the counterrevolutionaries. A decision to give an armed rebuff to the bandits was taken at the tribes' meetings. Their participants underlined that antigovernment activity carried out from Pakistani territory endangers the security of the population of Afghanistan.

[The Moscow World Service English news bulletin at 1000 GMT on 23 May carried an abridged version of this report, also read by Vladimir Danchev, which reads: "The population of Afghanistan plays an increasing role in defending the country's territory against bands infiltrated from Pakistan. Reports from Kabul say that tribes living in the eastern provinces of Nangarhar and Paktia have joined the struggle against the counterrevolutionaries."]

AFGHAN TRIBAL REPRESENTATIVES' ASSEMBLY REPORTED

LD230646 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 23 May 83

[Text] Kabul (CETEKA correspondent) -- Afghan tribes living in the mountainous areas in the eastern provinces of Nangarhar and Paktia are playing an ever bigger role in the protection of Afghan territory from the penetration of counterrevolutionary groups into Afghanistan from Pakistan.

The participants in a number of tribal assemblies said that bandit terrorist operations threaten the lives and property of the population of border areas.

For example, an assembly of representatives of eight tribes took place recently in the town of Sharan in Paktia Province. Also present was Sulayman Laeq, minister for nationality and tribal affairs, who stressed in his speech that attacks by counter-revolutionaries from training camps in Pakistan are aimed against the interests of the whole peace-loving population of Afghanistan. The policy of the revolutionary government is therefore designed to safeguard the state's security and create conditions for a peaceful life of the population.

This assembly appreciated the help of state bodies in the solution of tribal affairs, and stressed that members of tribes living in the area will take part in the fight against bandits.

ALLEGED HERAT COMBAT OPERATIONS DENIED

LD211711 Moscow TASS in English 1634 GMT 21 May 83

[Text] Kabul May 21 TASS -- Today the BAKHTAR News Agency circulated the following statement: "Lately Western mass media are intensively spreading slanderous inventions and malicious rumours as to alleged large-scale combat operations in Herat and on its outskirts, the operations which have allegedly done damage to civilians. The U.S. Department of State has also joined in the slanderous campaign.

"In this connection the BAKHTAR News Agency is authorized to state that no large-scale combat operations, or bombings, as the Western press asserts, have been or are being conducted either in Herat or on its outskirts. In the city itself and throughout the province the situation is calm on the whole. The people of the area, just as all over the country, engage in peaceful work."

This is not the first slanderous campaign unleashed by the mass media of the West, the statement goes on. "No such kind of propagandist tricks can delude the world public opinion. It is well known to the whole world that Afghanistan is the target of an undeclared war which is being conducted by world imperialism and reaction. Bands which are formed from among counterrevolutionary rabble were and continue to be infiltrated into its territory. The bands terrorize civilian population and sow death and destruction on the sacred soil of Afghanistan. These attacks by the enemies of the revolution have been resolutely suppressed and will continue to be suppressed by the country's security forces which stand on guard of the life, honour, and dignity of Afghan citizens."

"As for the 'concern' of the U.S. Department of State," BAKHTAR stresses, "it is the height of the Reagan administration's hypocrisy. The White House is concerned rather over the fact that the revolutionary people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan firmly follow the chosen road of the building of a free and prosperous motherland while attempts by international imperialism's hirelings being infiltrated into the country to hinder this suffer one failure after another," the news agency points out.

AUCCTU'S SHALAYEV ON 'WORKING VISIT' TO POLAND

Begins Activities 18 May

PM201000 Moscow TRUD in Russian 20 May 83 p 3

[Dispatch by correspondent Yu Vasilkov: "Meetings on Polish Soil"]

[Text] Warsaw-Katowice, 19 May -- AUCCTU chairman S.A. Shalayev arrived in Poland 18 May on a working visit.

A talk took place at the PZPR Central Committee, during which questions pertaining to the country's domestic political and economic situation and the party's work at the present stage were broached. Taking part in the talk on the Polish side were W. Mokrzyszczak, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo; M. Rakowski, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers; S. Gabrielski, director of the PZPR Central Committee Social and Vocational Department; I. Piatkowski, acting director of the PZPR Central Committee Foreign Affairs Department; S. Ciosek, minister of labor, wages, and social affairs; and Z. Salwa, chairman of the presidium of the Public Consultative Commission for Trade Union Questions under the polish Council of State. USSR Ambassador to Poland B.I. Aristov also attended the talk.

During the second half of the day S.A. Shalayev visited Warsaw's Ursus Tractor Plant. He toured the enterprise's shops and visited the museum of labor traditions.

A meeting with the trade union aktiv and representatives of the labor collective took place at the Ursus Culture Center. First Deputy Director W. Ziolek spoke of the enterprise's production activity and the preparations to mark a memorial date in its history -- the 90th anniversary of the start of production and the assembly of the one-millionth tractor. Party Committee Secretary M. Zielinski informed the guests of the sociopolitical situation in the collective.

Trade Union Committee Chairman A. Dudewicz spoke of the activity of the plant trade union. He noted that the successes in establishing the new trade unions mean a gradual overcoming of the consequences of subversive activity by the political enemy who, as is well known, picked Ursus after August 1980 as a base for antisocialist activity in Poland's central region. We are striving to create a trade union in line with the aspirations of the labor collective, A. Dudewicz stressed. It will stand unambiguously on class positions on the basis of loyalty to the ideas of socialism.

The plant representatives who spoke expressed the hope that the good traditions of cooperation with the Soviet working people and especially the relations of friendship with the Minsk Tractor Plant, which is twinned with Ursus, will be restored and further developed.

AUCCTU chairman S.A. Shalayev then took the floor. He conveyed ardent greetings to the enterprise collective from the USSR's working people and trade unions. The speaker told of the practical work of Soviet trade unions. He noted that the Soviet working people greet with satisfaction the situation in Poland. Speaking of the rebirth of the trade union movement, the AUCCTU chairman voiced the hope that the Polish trade unions, recreated on a class basis, will be true spokesmen of the interests of labor collectives.

S.A. Shalayev answered questions from the audience. On behalf of the AUCCTU he presented a picture of Moscow's Kremlin as a gift.

In the morning of 19 May AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev flew to Katowice Voivodship, Poland's major industrial region. A talk was held with Z. Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Katowice Voivodship party committee, and other voivodship leaders. At the central Square in the city of Czeladz, S.A. Shalayev laid flowers at the monument in honor of the communists who rose against the Pilsudski regime in 1927 and set up their own city council. Afterwards the Soviet guest visited the Czerwona Gwardia coal mine and met with representatives of the labor collective. Trade union committee Chairman W. Raczynski announced that the organization already unites more than half the workers here, that it is striving to concentrate attention on problems perturbing the miners and also having national economic significance, and that it is trying to be the administration's partner in solving these problems. Committee members and leaders of specialized commissions spoke of the trade union's specific work.

S.A. Shalayev delivered a speech. He noted with special satisfaction that none other than the miners -- the guardsmen of the working class -- were the first to contribute to starting the process of stabilizing Poland's economy and helped to overcome the hardships with their selfless labor. The AUCCTU chairman voiced the hope the the good, long-standing traditions of freindship between the USSR's and Poland's miners will be further augmented in the nearest future. This will be a contribution to strengthening the fraternal relations between the two countries.

A meeting also took place with representatives from the trade union and the labor collective of the Bobrek metallurgical combine. One of the vivid examples of Polish-Soviet friendship is linked with this enterprise. A quarter of a century ago the Novokramatorskiy heavy machine building plant and Leningrad's Elektrosila plant assisted in modernizing the production process. Now the Bobrek plant is operating smoothly. The recently established trade union has taken its place in the collective's public life. The same evening AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev flew from Katowice to Rakow.

Visits Krakow Combine

PM231051 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 May 83 p 3

[Report by correspondent Yu. Vasilkov: "The Visit Continues"]

[Excerpts] Warsaw, 20 May -- AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev is continuing his working visit to Poland. He has had a conversation with J. Gajewicz, first secretary of Krakow PZPR Committee, and with city and voivodship leaders.

On 20 May S.A. Shalayev visited the Krakow V.I. Lenin metallurgical combine. He toured the converter shop and accquainted himself with the production process. This was followed by a meeting with the enterprise party and trade union aktiv. E. Pustowka, general director of the combine, and K. Miniura, secretary of the PZPR Committee, and representatives of the trade union committee in various shops talked about the collective's life and its production activity.

S. Szczytkowski, deputy chairman of the trade union committee, said in his speech that the staff of the Vladimir Ilich Lenin combine remember numerous examples of cooperation and contacts with Soviet people. This cooperation has a long history and has always served common interests. For us members of a resurrected trade union, every visit by representatives of the Soviet Union is a special, important event.

The representatives of the labor collective and of the leading Polish industrial combine were warmly greeted by AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev. He stressed that friendship between the Soviet and Polish peoples is rooted in the proletariat's joint struggle for liberation from exploitation at the turn of the centry; it was sealed by the blood shed in the struggle against facism, and it underwent widespread development in the years after the war. S.A. Shalayev supported the desire, expressed in speeches by representatives of the Lenin combine, to resurrect the traditions of cooperation with the Azovstal Plant in Zhdanov. Friendship between works of sister enterprises has great significance for strengthening ties between peoples.

The Polish trade union movement is getting a great deal of different advice from many ill-wishers in the West, the speaker continued. It is all designed to divorce trade unions from the party and from the socialist state. The AUCCTU chairman expressed the hope that the new Polish trade unions would be able to find their correct place in socialist society. M. Rakowski, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, participated in the meeting at the V.I. Lenin metallurgical combine.

AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev laid flowers at the V.I. Lenin Memorial in Nowa Huta, a district of Krakow. On the same day the AUCCTU chairman returned to Warsaw. At a press conference for Polish journalists and the socialist countries' Warsaw correspondents he shared his impressions of his visit to the enterprise and his familiarization with the activity of the Polish trade unions which are being set up on a class basis.

Meets Jaruzelski

PM230916 Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 May 83 p 3

[Correspondent Yu. Vasilkov dispatch: "Visit Concluded"]

[Text] Warsaw, 21 May -- W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, has received S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, currently on a working visit in Poland.

During the meeting the AUCCTU chairman briefed the first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee on the Soviet trade unions' activities in implementing their seventh congress decisions. At the same time he gave his impressions of meetings and discussions with trade union representatives at Warsaw, Katowice and Krakow Voivodship enterprises.

During the meeting opinions were exchanged on the role of party members in trade union work. The need to expand cooperation between the two fraternal countries' trade unions was noted.

The meeting was attended by S. Gabrielski, chief of the PZPR Central Committee Social and Vocational Section, and B.A. Aristov, USSR ambassador to Poland.

S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, left Warsaw for home 21 May. Among those seeing him off at the airport were: W. Mokrzyszczak, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; S. Gabrielski, chief of the PZPR Central Committee Social and Vocational Section; and B.I. Aristov, USSR ambassador to Poland.

TASS REPORTS ON JUNE NATO AIR EXERCISES

LD211348 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 21 May 83

[Text] Brussels, May 21 TASS -- Big NATO air exercises are to be held in the area of central Europe on June 6-10. As was reported by the Supreme Command of the Joint Armed Forces of NATO in Europe, combat planes of Belgium, Canada, the United States, Britain, FRG and the Netherlands are to be involved in the exercises, code-named "Central Enterprises-83". The aim of the NATO military exercises is to check combat preparedness and test cooperation between air force units in the course of tactical operations. The exercises will mainly be held in the air space of the FRG and Benelux countries, and also over France, Britain and Denmark.

TURKISH REFUSAL OF U.S. TRANSMITTERS NOTED

PM132156 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 83 First Edition p 5

[Vladimir Bolshakov "Commentator's Column": "The 'Crusaders' of the Air Waves"]

[Text] The Turkish Government recently rejected a U.S. request for the stationing on its territory of 11 radio transmitters for the CIA's Radio Liberty-Radio Free Europe [RL-RFE] radio stations and also for VOA, that mouthpiece of the U.S. Information Agency.

As the newspaper MILLIYET writes, Ankara has expressed the fear that the provision of Turkish territory for such apparatus could have an adverse effect on the character of the good-neighborly relations between Turkey and the USSR. This is a just fear. And it is strange that it is not shared in the FRG and other NATO countries where the U.S. radio saboteurs have their headquarters and transmitters. After all, Washington has in essence begun the creation of new bases for U.S. ideological aggression.

The United States has always regarded "psychological warfare" as part of Washington's global military policy. It was for that reason that after World War II the United States set up a network of radio transmitters for disseminating slander against socialism and appeals to "combat communism" fabricated by RL-RFE centers, VOA, and so forth, while at the same time building military bases along the borders of the USSR and other socialist states. With the advent to power of the Republican administration headed by R. Reagan, even greater reliance was placed on the use of subversive radio broadcasting with the aim of "destabilizing existing regimes" in socialist countries, as a USIA document says.

The fiscal 1983 budget specifically allocated RL-RFE around $20 million extra for "expanding the geography" of the CIA's slanderous broadcasts. That envisaged the creation of "radio branches" in Turkey and northern Pakistan as well as in an area of the Pacific for broadcasting to Afghanistan, Near East countries "unfriendly" to the United States, and the socialist countries of Southeast Asia. Some $10 million were requested for subversive broadcasting to Cuba. The aim of such broadcasting -- the changing of the existing systems in those countries that are the targets of the CIA and USIA mouthpieces in a direction that suits the United States -- was also determined in accordance with Presidential Directive No 75, adopted at the beginning of this year. Therein lies the paramount task of the "crusade against communism" declared by the White House and the latter-day "Reagan doctrine" which, as THE WASHINGTON POST wrote recently, virtually claims a U.S. "right to infringe other states' sovereignty." The newspaper rightly notes that such attempts will "turn logic into absurdity." And let us add that they are fraught with grave consequences in present-day international relations, which are already tense as is.

USSR PREPARED FOR FURTHER COOPERATION WITH FRG

LD202135 Moscow TASS in English 2122 GMT 20 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS -- The FRG continues to strengthen its positions of the largest trading partner of the USSR among the industrially developed countries of the West. In 1982, the volume of trade between the two states amounted to 6.6 billion roubles (about 23 billion marks), which is 65 percent higher than trade with Italy, 88 per cent higher than that with France, 78 percent higher than that with Japan, and 4.4 times more than the volume of trade with Britain. This year the Soviet-West German trade continues to develop at a fast pace.

For already a long period of time, the trade and economic relations between the USSR and the FRG have been characterized by the search for and implementation of new forms of cooperation, going beyond the framework of traditional trade, and in the final analysis -- a much more effective utilization of the advantages of the international division of labour in the interests of the economies of the two states.

An important role in this respect was played by intergovernmental agreements on questions of trade and economic cooperation, signed ten and five years ago, in May 1973 and in May 1978. These agreements have further developed in the "Long-term Programme of the Principal Directions in the USSR and the FRG Cooperation in the Field of Economy and Industry" [title as received] intended for the eighties.

Major and long-term cooperation projects, including those based on buy-back arrangements, provided the basis for stable business relations, strengthening the links between the important economic sectors of the two countries.

Such projects include the agreement on supplying the FRG with Soviet natural gas up to the year 2000, and on Soviet purchases of pipes and other materials for the construction of gas pipelines, cooperation in the construction of a complex to produce polyether fibres, and the Oskolskiy Electrical-Metallurgical Plant.

These are major projects in whose implementation many medium and small FRG firms are taking part. The partners of Soviet foreign-trade organizations include about two thousand West German firms, and the fulfillment of Soviet orders assures employment to hundreds of thousands of workers.

The opinion in the Moscow business community is that the positive heritage of the seventies can provide a good basis for a further development of cooperation in the eighties. The hope is expressed in this connection that the statement of the new FRG Government about its intention to continue the policy of cooperation with the socialist countries will translate itself into concrete actions. The Soviet Union is prepared for such cooperation.

USSR-LUXEMBOURG POLITICAL CONSULTATIONS HELD

LD201703 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 20 May 83

[Text] Luxembourg May 20 TASS -- Soviet-Luxembourg political consultations on questions of mutual interest were held here on May 19 and 20. Taking part in them were the General Secretary of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Yuriy Fokin, the USSR Ambassador in Luxembourg Kamo Udamyan, the General Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg J. Wagner, and high-placed officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg. Yuriy Fokin was received by the Chairman of the Government of Luxembourg Pierre Werner and also by Deputy Chairman of Government and Minister of Foreign Affairs Madam Colette Flesch.

EXPANSION OF U.S.-ISRAELI 'AGGRESSION' SCORED

ID191207 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1633 GMT 18 May 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Viktor Levin]

[Text] Let us turn to Reagan's statements on the Near East. He does not want the Soviet Union to play a part in settling the situation in that region. Reagan cherishes day-dreams of taking the law into his own hands there.

I asked our correspondent in Lebanon, Leonid Rassadin, to tell us about what this is leading to:

Following the signing of the so-called Israeli-Lebanese peace agreement, drawn up and concluded with the direct involvement of the United States, the situation here in Lebanon and around it has been further exacerbated. The most graphic result is the increased tension in the eastern Lebanese Al-Biqa' Valley.

It became known today that the Israeli command has moved heavy tanks to the actual disengagement line with the Syrian contingent of inter-Arab forces. In the Jubb Jannin sector, right up to the small town of Kamid al Lawz, the interventionists have hastily started constructing new fortifications, including positions for artillery guns. That is one aspect of the matter, the military one, which again confirms Israel's active military preparations. Thus, the American-Israeli-Lebanese agreement has clearly spurred Tel Aviv into large-scale military action against the Syrian Arab Republic.

In other words, the agreement is already creating specific preconditions for an expansion of U.S.-Israeli aggression in the Near East.

The Beirut press today throws additional light on the anti-Lebanese and anti-Arab plot of the United States and Israel. The papers write that they have signed in Washington a so-called memorandum of mutual understanding. Its gist: Israel intends to maintain its occupation of Lebanese territory. Naturally, there is an invented pretext for this -- the presence of Syrian troops in Lebanon. But the most notable fact is the memorandum's secret appendices. Their exact contents are not known, but the assumption is that the United States intends in the near future to resume the delivery of another 75 of the latest F-1[illegible] fighter-bombers to Israel.

[Levin] It remains only for me to add that the Soviet Union, as was stressed in the recent TASS statement, supports a united Lebanon, the restoration of its sovereignty and the guaranteeing of its independence and territorial integrity. Our country is altogether in favor of a just settlement of the Near East problem, and this includes guaranteeing the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to the creation of its own state. This position is not to the liking of Washington, which would like to dictate its will to everyone everywhere. Such ambitions have already been displayed in the past, but they led only to failure, and the sooner this is understood in the United States the better.

FURTHER ON LEBANESE-ISRAELI TROOP AGREEMENT

LD191828 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 19 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The newspaper WASHINGTON POST points out today that the Israeli-Lebanese agreement seems to be a highly successful deal for Israel.

This appraisal will hardly be denied by anybody! It is with the assistance and incitement of the USA that Tel Aviv has forced on Lebanon an agreement dooming that Arab state to military control and dependence on the Israeli aggressors. It does not matter too much whether this will be done through patrolling Lebanon's territory by Israeli military "observers" or through turning southern Lebanon into an Israeli protectorate which will be bossed by Tel Aviv's placeman, traitor Haddad. It is essential that, acting with vigorous support of the Reagan administration, Israel is continuing its imperialist policy of "forward frontiers,"by impudently invading the territory of the neighbour states under the pretext of ensuring its own "security."

That was the case with the West Bank of the Jordan River and Gaza sector, the Golan Heights, which are part of sovereign Syria's territory. The new victim is now Lebanon. The terms of "peace" imposed by Washington and Tel Aviv on the Lebanese side provide for numerous restrictions and duties only for Lebanon, while the United States and its "strategic partner" Israel retain a free hand as regards further actions in Lebanon itself and against the other Arab states from Lebanon's territory.

This inequality of the sides as regards the terms of the "peace agreement" is a direct result of the Israeli aggression and invasion of Lebanon. In that connection the public of many countries, including the Arab countries, is watching with alarm how, at the new stage of their anti-Arab collusion, Washington and Tel Aviv strive to teach all Arabs a "lesson," intimidate them and put them on their knees.

Highly indicative in the connection is the absence of official reaction from the Arab states in support of the "settlement" forced on Lebanon. This undoubtedly indicates that there is clear awareness in the Arab world that the Zionist circles and the Reagan administration strive to suppress the Arab countries one by one, and the question is only what is their next victim.

The ruling circles of the United States and Israel are particularly infuriated by the stand of Syria, whose government has resolutely condemned the fettering terms of the "agreement" on Lebanon, which not only infringes upon the interests of that country, but also flouts the political rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

At the same time, the principled and consistent anti-imperialist stand of Damacus ensures for it prestige and respect from the peoples of the Arab countries and all force of the world, which condemn the Israeli aggressors and their Washington patrons.

The peoples are indignant at Israel's aggressive preparations against Syria. The constitutes a direct threat from the Zionists to the courageous Arab state. If these plans of aggression are allowed to be implemented, the whole Arab world will find itself under the heal of the American-Israeli militarists, who are trying to subordinate to themselves through war the whole Middle East.

'Wider Consequences' Viewed

LD222206 Moscow Domestic Television in Russian 1400 GMT 22 May 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Text] And now a few words on the Lebanese-Israeli peace agreement. Let us look at it in specifics by examining the text, as it applies to Lebanon as well as on a broader basis as it applies to Syria, the Palestinians and the entire Near East problem.

According to reports in the papers, and as is officially recognized, for example, by U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Veliotes, the agreement is accompanied by secret proposals, but even from the actual text of the agreement it follows that in relation to Israel, Lebanon is reduced to the status of a semivassal state, and that is no secret.

The articles of the agreement do pay lip service to international law and the UN Charter. The articles supposedly concern both sides but in fact they place restrictions only on Lebanese sovereignty: It is only on Lebanese territory that the so-called security zones are being set up, in which control will be exercised by Lebanese personnel along with Israelis; it is only for Lebanon that there are strict regulations on how many and what sort of military and semimilitary units it can keep in this zone and with what staff and weapons these units can be provided. There are no restrictions for Israeli troops on the Israeli side of the border.

What does article say, for example? I will read it to you. The sides will not permit armed forces, military equipment and machinery belonging to a state hostile to one of the sides to be brought into their territory, to be deployed on it or to be transported through it. Let me draw your attention to the word hostile. A footnote to this article explains that a hostile country is seen as any state that does not have diplomatic relations with either of the two countries. That means that all Arab countries except Egypt become hostile not only to Israel but also to Lebanon. Furthermore, here is a crushing irony: Lebanon itself becomes a hostile state because the agreement does not in fact envisage the establishment of diplomatic relations between Israel and Lebanon. What is more, Lebanon does not have diplomatic relations with Israel but all its international links treaties, agreements and in effect its entire place in the world are henceforth made subject to the interests of Israel.

Is this not what article nine in the agreement says? I quote: During a period of not more than 1 year after this agreement comes into force each of the sides will take the necessary steps to annul all treaties, laws and regulations that contradict this agreement. The sides pledge not to fulfill existing duties that contradict the present agreement. Both sides pledge, but only Lebanon is affected.

Let us consider the wider consequences of this agreement. Syria will now be the object of interference by Israel and, of course, the United States. Also at issue is the further undermining of the Palestine liberation movement. Let us take article four, which says: Territories of both sides will not be used as a base for hostile or terrorist acts against the other side or its people. We already know the meaning of hostile -- anything that gets in Israel's way. Thus this article is aimed directly at Syrian troops in Lebanon, which were brought in at the invitation of the Lebanese Government and under the flag of the Arab League. As the London FINANCIAL TIMES noted, Lebanon is, in the light of this agreement, transformed from being an ally of the Arabs into an ally of Israel.

The main victim of the Israeli-Lebanese agreement remains the Palestinians. The agreement is based on a situation where there is no such thing as a Palestinian problem and where the only problem is that of Israel's security. Yet another attempt is being made to squeeze the Palestinians out of the Near East scene, although the Palestine problem, as is widely known, is the main issue in any true Near East settlement.

Further Views

LD192036 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 May 83

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program presented by (Vitaliy Kodinov)]

[Text] Now that Israel and the United States have imposed the so-called agreement on Lebanon, facing the turrets of cannons and tanks, the second stage of their expansionist policy in the Middle East has begun. The Zionists and imperialists believe that they are now threatening to embark on a new military intervention against Syria. This is indicated by the threats voiced by President Reagan and his Defense Secretary Weinberger, and also by Israeli Defense Minister Arens.

I would like to draw your attention to a very significant matter: The three spoke on the same day about an existing clear agreement between them. The Israeli defense minister was the most outspoken in his threats, which can be summed up as follows: If Syria refuses to submit to Israel's will, Israel will dictate the course of events. Translated into simple language, this means that Israel will embark on aggression. Arens added: The United States will not stand idle if an armed conflict with Syria breaks out, indicating by this the existence of an agreement between the two countries for joint action against Syria. In his enthusiasm Arens went so far as to say that Israel is ready to start a war against Syria even for Syria's mere refusal to release Israeli prisoners of war. This threat against an [word indistinct] Arab country received the support of U.S. leaders. President Reagan made a very indicative warning against the huge risk, to use his words, taken by Syria should it refuse to submit to the will of Israel. As for Weinberger, he called on Syria to abandon the measures consolidating its defensive capability, threatening that if Syria refuses to do so, the United States will increase its supplies of advanced modern weapons to Israel.

In this case, as Israel and the United States are openly threatening to intervene jointly against Syria, hinting that Jordan would also be hit after Syria, only unified and firm steps by the other Arab countries and by all patriotic and truly progressive forces can abort Zionists' and imperialists' plans and prevent a new aggression in the Middle East.

Syrian Defense Minister Cited

LD212040 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 21 May 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Our special correspondent Farid Seyful-Mulyukov has met with Syrian Defense Minister Mustafa Talas in Damascus and asked him to comment on the situation that has arisen in the Near East as a result of the signing of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement:

[Begin video recording; Farid Seyful-Mulyukov and Mustafa Talas are shown conducting interview in an office; in Arabic with superimposed translation]

[Mustafa Talas] We view the agreement concluded between Lebanon and Israel with the blessing of the United States as part of the Camp David deal. President Hafiz al-Asad has noted that this agreement meets Israel's interests. The sides which signed it are on an unequal footing. The United States put pressure on Lebanon and forced it to conclude the deal.

It effectively turns Lebanon into an Israeli protectorate: Israel will control a considerable part of Lebanese territory, and in particular the south of the country.

The agreement legalizes the Israeli military presence in Lebanon and puts the country under Israeli control. Tel Aviv is thus striving to consolidate the results of its aggression.

[Question] How do you respond to the Israeli and U.S. threats against Syria?

[Answer] U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger made attacks against Syria a few days ago. Evidently his nerves got the better of him, and he started threatening our country, which has rejected the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. Weinberger made no secret of the fact that the United States is primarily interested in the Israeli military machine, and he stressed that the United States is linked to Israel by strategic interests. It was precisely in these interests that the Israeli aggression against Lebanon was unleashed. The same interests are served by the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. We are not afraid of the threats which are ringing out in Washington and Tel Aviv. We shall defend our legitimate rights and our honor. The peace which America wishes to foist on us is a servile peace, while we want to live free in our own land. [end recording]

The Syrian leadership, Mustafa Talas stressed, highly appraises the stand which the friendly Soviet Union adopts towards the Arab nations, and particularly Syria, which are struggling against the aggressive intrigues of Israel and the United States.

Anti-Zionist Group Cited

PM190908 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Firm Demands"]

[Text] The Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public has joined in alarm, anger, and indignation the demands by millions of Soviet people who are speaking these days in defense of peace and justice in the Near East.

Angry indignation has been caused by the present U.S. political blackmail pursuing the goal of ensuring the implementation of U.S. strategic plans in the Near East under cover of the "Lebanese-Israeli peace agreement" and consolidating the U.S. political and military positions there.

In this way the United States is trying to bring its political vassal, Israel, out of the blind alley of international isolation and to extinguish the international public's anger toward the Begin clique and the leaders of international Zionism who are supporting it.

Is it possible to describe as a "peace agreement" an act of political arbitrariness, which does not permit the region's inhabitants to breath freely? Just as in the past, there is still no peace or tranquility, no hope of peace and tranquility, beneath the cedars of Lebanon, in the long-suffering Lebanese land.

In the long term, the "agreement" does not bring peace, nor does it extinguish the conflagration started and fanned by the Zionists in this tense part of the world. No, the "agreement" is just one more stage in the process of escalating militarism and exacerbating tension in the Near East.

The "peace agreement" is just an attempt to legalize Tel Aviv's expansionism and the plans to expand the bridgehead of aggression, just a step toward new military adventures and new aggressive actions against the neighboring Arab countries.

The "agreement" contains all the elements of a bondage deal. It corresponds with the interests of only one side, it is based upon diktat, it has neither a voluntary character nor equality of the sides' positions. The "agreement" directly damages Lebanon's interests.

The anti-Zionist committee of the Soviet public has called, in all determination and without reservation, upon all honest people in the world to voice the demand for the unconditional termination of Israeli occupation in Lebanon, withdrawal of all Israeli troops from its territory, and restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

PLO Envoy Cited

LD211833 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 21 May 83

[Talk by PLO representative in USSR Muhammad ash-Sha'ir -- recorded]

[Excerpts] Sadly, some Arab rulers have been deceived into thinking that the main purpose of the U.S.-Lebanese-Israeli agreement is really the eviction of the Israeli Army from Lebanon, and that this agreement is the only guarantee for removing Israel from Lebanon and establishing peace. The Arab countries ought to reject this disgraceful and shameful agreement, which is worse in its substance than the Camp David agreement, and pursue and insist on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509, which specify the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanese territories without any condition or reservations.

TASS REPORTS KILLING OF SOVIET NUNS IN JERUSALEM

LD210951 Moscow TASS in English 0848 GMT 21 May 83

[Text] New York May 21 TASS -- According to news agencies' reports, two nuns -- Soviet citizens -- have been atrociously killed in a Jerusalem suburb in one of the monasteries belonging to the Russian Orthodox Church.

As has been admitted by a local chief of police, arson attempts and acts of vandalism have been repeatedly made lately against the premises of the Russian Orthodox Church in Jerusalem. The monastery was recently desecrated by swastikas daubed on its walls. An arson attempt was made by means of a gas cylinder placed outside its outer fencing. The clergymen of the church have stated that local police measures to protect the church representations were obviously insufficient.

The criminal attacks against the Russian church are a continuation of the acts of vandalism being staged by the Zionists with the connivance of the Israeli authorities both in Israel itself and in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories against various religious institutions.

Two French monasteries were desecrated several weeks ago. Still earlier a Greek monk had died at the hand of a citizen of Israel in the town of Nabulus in the occupied West Bank of the Jordan.

The setting fire to Al-Aqsa' Mosque -- one of the Moslem shrines -- became notorious in the world and gave rise to a wave of indignation in Arab countries and among the public of other states. Systematic encroachments on worship institutions on the part of the Zionist thugs have become the characteristic feature of the Tel Aviv regime's policy. The basis for such a criminal practice is provided by the man-hating ideology of Zionism mixed with rabid chauvinism and the intensively implanted cult of violence.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON DOS SANTOS USSR VISIT

Kiev Hosts Delegation

AU201544 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0230 GMT 20 May 83

[Text] On 19 May, Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, and Jose Eduardo dos Santos, MPLA chairman and president of the People's Republic of Angola, who is in the Soviet Union on a working friendly visit, met in the headquarters of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee in Kiev.

Participating in the conversation were Vatchenko, Ukranian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman; Lyashko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Council of Ministers chairman; Yelchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Kiev Gorkom first secretary; and Kapto, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate member and secretary.

During the conversation, the great importance was stressed of the talks held in Moscow by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and other Soviet leaders with Jose Eduardo dos Santos, and of the Soviet-Angolan documents signed for the further consolidation of friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and the MPLA, between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Angola. Satisfaction was expressed with the successful development of Soviet-Angolan relations, and with the great contribution made toward it by the Soviet Ukraine.

Comrade Shcherbitskiy familiarized the guest with the activity of the republic's party organization in implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the May and November 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenums, with the socioeconomic and cultural development of the Ukrainian SSR, and with its part in cooperation with the People's Republic of Angola.

Jose Eduardo dos Santos expressed cordial thanks for the warm and hospitable reception. He emphasized that his tour of the country has enabled him to familiarize himself in a specific way with the achievements and experience in building a developed socialist society in the Soviet Union.

Present at the conversation were, on the Soviet side, Kozlovskiy, USSR minister of geology; Loginov, USSR ambassador to Angola; and Likhachev, department chief in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who are accompanying Jose Eduardo dos Santos on the country tour; as well as Masol, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman and Gosplan chairman; Vrublevskiy, assistant to the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; Merkulov, department chief in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; and Martynenko, Ukrainian foreign affairs minister. On the Angolan side, present were: Tonha Pedale, MPLA Central Committee Politburo member and defense minister; A. van Dunem Mbinda, MPLA Central Committee secretary for foreign relations; Pedro de Castro van Dunem, minister of energy and the petroleum industry; Teixeira de Matos, minister of finance and National Bank manager; Faxla Marianda Roze, General Staff National chief of service troops; and De Castro, ambassador of the Angolan People's Republic to the Soviet Union.

The conversation was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

On 19 May, Dos Santos and the party figures and politicians of the People's Republic of Angola accompanying him, visited the memorial complex -- the Ukrainian State Museum of the History of the Great Patriotic War 1941-45, and acquainted themselves with its expositions.

The Angolan comrades toured the city, familiarized themselves with its projects, and its architectural and historical monuments. The envoys of Angola were warmly welcomed by the laborers of the Pushcha Voditsa Sovkhoz Agroindustrial Enterprise in Kiyevo-Svyatoshinskiy Rayon.

Jose Eduardo dos Santos was accompanied by Vatchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman; Tsybulko, Kiev Obkom first secretary; Lysenko, Kiev Oblispolkom chairman; Zgurskiy, Kiev Gorispolkom chairman; Merkulov, department chief in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; and Martynenko, Ukrainian foreign affairs minister.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium and Government gave a dinner yesterday in the Maryinskiy Palace in honor of Jose Eduardo dos Santos, MPLA chairman and president of the People's Republic of Angola. The Angolan party figures and statesmen accompanying Dos Santos were together with him.

Those attending the dinner on the Soviet side were: Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; Vatchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman; Lyashko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Council of Ministers chairman; Army General Gerasimov, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and commander of the troops of the red banner Kiev Military District; Yelchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Kiev Gorkom first secretary; Kapto, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate member and secretary; and Mukha, Ukrainain Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate member and Ukrainian State Security Committee chairman. Also present at the dinner were: deputy chairmen of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, Ukrainian ministers, and other officials.

Vatchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, delivered a speech at the dinner. On behalf of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium and Government, on behalf of the Ukrainian people, he cordially welcomed Jose Eduardo dos Santos and other Angolan guests. The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman emphasized that the People's Republic of Angola contributed a great part in the cause of eradicating the remnants of colonialism and racism on the African Continent, in the struggle for international detente and disarmament. The Soviet Union has been and is a loyal friend of the Angolan people.

Jose Eduardo dos Santos delivered a speech in reply. He noted the active role of the Ukrainian SSR in developing economic and cultural relations between the Soviet Union and Angola. Jose Eduardo dos Santos said that the Angolan people resolutely supported the peace-loving foreign policy pursued by the USSR aimed at international detente and at precluding a nuclear catastrophe.

The dinner passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Moscow Departure Comparison

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 May carries in its First Edition, on page 1, a TASS report on the Moscow sendoff for Angolan President Dos Santos at Vnukovo Airport. The PRAVDA report has been compared with the Moscow Domestic Service version published in the 19 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page J 1, and was found to be identical with the exception of the following addition:

Paragraph two, last line, the PRAVDA version reads: ...and other officials.

The guest was also seen off by T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; USSR Ministers T.B. Guzhenko and V.M. Kamentsev; S.A. Skachkov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; USSR First Deputy Ministers N.V. Ogarkov and B. Ye. Panyukov; G.K. Tsinev, first deputy chairman of the USSR KGB; R.A. Ulyanovskiy, deputy chief of the CPSU Central International Department; L.F. Ilichev, USSR deputy foreign minister; D.S. Nikiforov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Protocol Department; and other officials.

J.E. dos Santos is accompanied on his trip by USSR Minister Ye.A. Kozlovskiy; V.P. Loginov, USSR Ambassador to Angola; and V.A. Likhachev, chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry department.

Soviet-Angolan Communique

PM201558 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 83 First Edition pp 1, 4

[Unattributed "Joint Soviet-Angolan Communique"]

[Text] At the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party [MPLA-PT] and president of the People's Republic of Angola [PRA] was in the Soviet Union from 16 through 20 May 1983 on a working, friendly visit.

J.E. dos Santos laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall. In addition, to Moscow the high-ranking Angolan guests visited the Ukrainian SSR.

During his stay in Moscow J.E. dos Santos had a conversation with Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Meetings and discussions were also held with N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR foreign minister; D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; and B.N. Ponomarev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary fo the CPSU Central Committee.

In the course of the meetings and discussions held, which proceeded in a warm and friendly atmosphere and in a spirit of complete mutual understanding, topical international problems of mutual interest as well as questions of Soviet-Angolan relations were discussed.

An agreement on cooperation between the CPSU and the MPLA-PT, a plan for party ties between the CPSU and the MPLA-PT, and also a protocol on cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and the PRA for 1983-84 were signed.

The following took part in the meetings and talks.

On the Soviet side: Comrades N.K. Baybakov, S.A. Skachkov, N.V. Ogarkov, G.K. Zhuravlev, L.F. Ilichev, R.A. Ulyanovskiy, V.P. Loginov, and V.A. Likhachev.

On the Angolan side: Comrades P.M. Tonha Pedale, P. Luvualu, A. van Dunem Mbinda, P. Jorge, L. do Nascimento, P. de Castro van Dunem Loi, A. Teixeira de Matos, and L.D.P. de Castro.

The exchange of opinions which took place reaffirms the coincidence of the Soviet Union's and the PRA's positions on the cardinal questions of the present day.

The sides noted with profound concern that, as a result of the further activation of aggressive forces, the development of events in the world is assuming a dangerous character. Imperialist circles, first and foremost the United States, are trying to shake the only sensible foundation for relations between states with different social systems -- the principle of peaceful coexistence -- and are pursuing a policy of diktat and interference in sovereign states' internal affairs. This is causing significant damage to the relaxation of tension which brought the peoples positive results in the seventies. The attempts by bellicose U.S. and some U.S. allied circles to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the other socialist countries are leading to international instability and to an increased danger of nuclear war.

J.E. dos Santos expressed full approval and support for the Soviet peace initiatives and the proposals contained in the Warsaw Pact states' Prague Political Declaration.

The Soviet Union and Angola came out for the urgent need to establish a just and lasting peace in the Near East and denounced Israel's continuing aggression against Lebanon and its military preparations against Syria.

The two sides confirmed their full support for the DRA and the peace-loving initiatives of the Indochina countries and denounced reaction's intrigues against the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

The sides stated their solidarity with all democratic forces of Latin America and denounced the aggressive U.S. course with respect to Cuba, Nicaragua, and Grenada.

The sides noted with satisfaction the growing role of the Nonaligned Movement, whose anti-imperialist and antimilitarist nature was again demonstrated by the conference of nonaligned heads of state and government in Delhi.

Those taking part in the talks paid special attention to the situation in Africa and primarily the south of the continent where a tense situation persists, creating a threat to international peace.

In this connection they examined questions connected with the situation in and around Angola. It was noted that the source of tension in this region is the Republic of South Africa with its policy of apartheid, racism and colonialism, which is manifested particularly in interference in the affairs of neighboring sovereign states and their destabilization with the aid of both its own armed forces and splittist puppet groupings. The sides emphasized that the steering of this course is promoted by the constantly growing support for the Pretoria regime by the United States, other NATO countries, and Israel.

The Soviet Union confirmed its solidarity with the "Frontline" African states and primarily Angola in their selfless struggle for the total liberation of southern Africa.

The Soviet Union and Angola demand the halting of all the destabilizing actions of imperialism and the Republic of South Africa against Angola -- both direct actions and those using Angolan counterrevolution -- and also the immediate and complete withdrawal of the South African troops which continue to occupy the southern part of Angolan territory.

The USSR and Angola assess highly the role of the Cuban internationalist forces which are in Angola to help safeguard the country's security under the conditions of the persisting threat of outside aggression.

The Soviet Union again resolutely declared its support for the 4 February 1982 Angolan-Cuban statement on the presence of Cuban troops in the PRA. The sides reject the U.S. and Republic of South Africa attempt to link the question of granting independence to Namibia with the Cuban military contingent's presence in Angola.

The sides confirmed their unvarying support for the Namibian people's national liberation struggle under the leadership of the South-West Africa People's Organization and stated the need to implement immediately and in full the UN decisions on granting independence to Namibia, including Security Council Resolution 435.

The USSR and Angola oppose the attempts by the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa and its Western patrons to resolve the Namibian question bypassing the United Nations, and note that the talks on a settlement in Namibia held recently with the mediation of the "Contact Group" of Western states have reached deadlock, because they are being used by the United States and the Republic of South Africa for purposes which have nothing in common with the UN decisions.

The sides once again proclaimed solidarity with the liberation struggle of the people of South Africa, under the leadership of the African National Congress, for the liquidation of the inhuman system of exploitation and racial oppression.

When considering the situation in Africa, both sides evaluate highly the OAU's significance for the cause of maintaining peace and security on the continent and for the African people's struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and racism and for strengthening the sovereignty and independence of the countries of Africa. Confidence was expressed that African states will deal a worthy rebuff to the attempts by the forces of imperialism and reaction to secure the OAU's collapse and will be able to preserve and strengthen its cohesion.

The sides voiced satisfaction with the state of and the prospects for the development of multifaceted cooperation between the USSR and the PRA, which is developing on the sound basis of the friendship and cooperation treaty. This fully accords with the two countries' interests and serves the cause of strengthening world peace and the people's security.

The leaders of the USSR and the PRA attach great significance to realizing the program of economic and technical cooperation and also trade for 1981-85 and for the long term through 1990 and intend to promote its successful implementation.

Both sides noted the strengthening fraternal ties between the CPSU and the MPLA-PT -- ties built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism -- and their great significance for Soviet-Angolan relations and for the world revolutionary movement. The sides will contribute in every possible way to the further development and strengthening of interparty cooperation, as well as of ties between various public organizations in the USSR and the PRA.

J.E. dos Santos familiarized the Soviet leaders with the measures being implemented in Angola to carry out progressive socioeconomic transformations aimed at building the foundations of socialism in the country, as well as with the Angolan people's struggle against the revolution's gains. The Angolan side evaluated highly the internationalist assistance and support of the Soviet Union, Cuba, and other socialist countries in developing the economy and strengthening the defense capability of the PRA.

Yu.V. Andropov hailed the immutable policy of the MPLA-PT and the Angolan people aimed at defending the revolutionary gains and creating the foundations of a socialist society and declared that the Soviet Union will firmly side with the PRA in defense of its sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity.

J.E. dos Santos was informed about the Soviet people's labor successes and the activity of the party and the Soviet state in fulfilling the 26th CPSU Congress decision and hailed the USSR's achievements in communist building, noting that they are a very important factor in the strengthening of the forces of peace, progress, and socialism.

Both sides voiced satisfaction with the results of the meetings and talks held. They advocated the further development of Soviet-Angolan relations of fraternal friendship and mutually advantageous economic, scientific, technical, and commercial cooperation and confirmed the importance of continuing the practice of exchanging opinions and holding consultations at various levels on international problems of mutual interest and on question of strengthening bilateral ties.

J.E. dos Santos evaluated highly the cordial welcome and hospitality given him and the persons accompanying him and invited Yu.V. Andropov to pay an official friendly visit to the PRA. This invitation was gratefully accepted. The timing of the visit at a time acceptable to both sides will be determined later and agreed on through diplomatic channels.

Telegram to Andropov

PM231136 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] To Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee:

Esteemed Yuriy Vladimirovich,

On leaving the city of Kiev and completing my friendly working visit to the Soviet Union, on behalf of the entire Angolan delegation and on my own account, I express the sincerest gratitude to you and to the CPSU Central Committee for the warm reception accorded us -- evidence of the splendid relations which exist between our parties and states.

The atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding in which the talks between our delegation and the top Soviet party and state leaders were held is clear proof for the MPLA-Labor Party, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola that our country may continue in the future to count on the kind aid and cooperation from the Soviet Union and its Communist Party in matters of strengthening our defense potential and protecting the independence and territorial integrity of Angola.

We are leaving your country with the certainty that the documents that have been signed are an important landmark in our relations since -- as we are convinced -- they will promote the broadening and consolidation of the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the peoples, parties, and governments of our countries.

Please accept, Yuriy Vladimirovich, wishes for good health and prosperity.

With the highest fraternal respect,

[Signed] Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the MPLA-Labor Party and president of the People's Republic of Angola

Soltan Commentary

LD211450 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1730 GMT 18 May 83

[Yuriy Soltan commentary]

[Text] The Soviet Union, which is one of the biggest countries in the world, and Angola which has just achieved independence from the imperialists are two countries who share common ideals about world peace and both of them follow the socialist road to development and both pursue the ideals of freedom and independence. These principles are basic to cooperation between these two countries. The friendship between these two countries is based on equality, mutual respect, and mutual trust.

In the talks they held in Moscow, the leaders of the Soviet Union and Angola wanted to reinforce their friendship. This is very important because of the state of affairs in the world generally. Cooperation between states would minimize the risk of outbreak of a deadly war.

Those who are in control in the United States are blatantly using missiles as a nuclear war threat. They are using political and economic pressures to achieve their objectives, particularly in the control of independent states in Africa. This is done in order to increase and strengthen the hold of the imperialist powers. This makes this country concerned about its independence.

It is now several years that South Africa, with the support of the United States, has been waging war against the people of Angola. But on the other hand Angola is not alone, it has friends. The assistance from these countries helps to stabilize Angola. This is particularly the case because Angola is following a new path of development similar to that followed by socialist states.

In the talks held in Moscow, the Soviet Union pledged anew to assist the people of Angola in their effort to protect their freedom and independence. They greatly reproached the tricks of the United States and its friends in delaying the freedom and independence of Namibia, under the pretext of the presence of Cuban military personnel in Angola, who are there because of their international solidarity.

The President of Angola, Eduardo Jose dos Santos, expressed his appreciation for the support his country is receiving from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is popular because of its support for our country at a time when we are building a new life in this country, President dos Santos said.

President dos Santos greatly extolled what has been proposed by the Soviet Union in its attempt to curb the arms race. This would help improve relations between the two countries [as heard] and end a state of tension among nations.

The talks between the leaders of the Soviet Union and Angola, Eduardo Jose dos Santos and Yuriy Andropov, will strengthen the friendship between these two countries afresh. This will help to curb the influence of imperialists and fascist in the whole of Africa.

TASS ASSAILS REAGAN REMARKS ON LATIN AMERICA

LD211516 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1408 GMT 21 May 83

[Text] Washington, 21 May (TASS) -- President R. Reagan made a routine anti-Soviet and antisocialist speech in Miami, Florida. In it he defended the policy being conducted by his administration of crude military, political, and economic interference in the affairs of the countries of Central and Latin America.

The occupant of the White House did not choose the venue for his speech by accident. It is precisely this city which has been turned into a "vipers nest" of Cuban counter-revolution where plots are being woven under the guidance of the CIA against socialist Cuba, Nicaragua, and other progressive states of the region. Here terrorist organizations such as Omega-7 and Alpha-66 operate unhindered. As the CBS television network points out, Reagan's ardent anticommunism has won him particular popularity among the counterrevolutionaries who have fled from Cuba.

In this favorable atmosphere, to the applause of his fellow thinkers, the head of the administration made crude attacks on the Cuban Government, even going so far as to say that Cuba, allegedly, is not "an independent state." Reagan praised the anti-Cuban rabble in every way for its active participation in subversive activity against the island of freedom and did not conceal the fact that his administration is going to step up hostile activity against Cuba.

It is indicative that only a few days before his speech in Miami Reagan adopted a decision on the "complete and unconditional pardon" of the former CIA agent and Cuban counterrevolutionary terrorist Eugenio Martinez, who was imprisoned. for his participation in the "Watergate raid" on the Democratic Party's headquarters in Washington sanctioned by the White House in 1972. He took an active part in many terrorist attacks against liberated Cuba organized by the U.S. spy department, including the Bay of Pigs incursion which ended in shameful failure, and also in the attempts to organize an attempt on the life of Fidel Castro. Now such people as Martinez are clearly needed by the administration to organize new subversion against the island of freedom, and the White House readily forgives all of the bandits' sins.

During his speech, the President virtually gave Congress an ultimatum to adopt legislation as soon as possible on the setting up of a subversive anti-Cuban radio station with the help of which Washington intends to sharply intensify its psychological warfare against a sovereign socialist state.

At the initial stage alone it is planned to allocate about $10 million for the requirements of this disinformation and slander center. Subsequently, the allocations will be considerably increased.

While deliberating about freedom and democracy, which he purports to defend, Reagan also stated, without any embarrassment, that he would support in every possible way the thoroughly rotten despotic regimes in El Salvador and Guatemala, the victims of whose bloody repressions number tens of thousands of people. He attempted once again to foist on the peoples of Central America a "military solution" to their socioeconomic problems and confirmed yet again Washington's intention to suppress by force of arms their struggle for freedom and democracy and against imperialist oppression by the United States. Reagan demanded that Congress approve the administration's plans for a considerable increase in supplies of U.S. weapons to bloody dictatorships. The White House boss was energetic, too, in championing his notorious "Caribbean initiative" which calls for about $300 million to be allocated to regimes friendly to the United States, primarily for purchase of up-to-date U.S. weapons.

SECURITY COUNCIL NICARAGUA DEBATE REPORTED

PM201052 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Soldatov dispatch: "Respecting International Norms"]

[Text] New York [no date given] -- The sessions of the Security Council discussing Nicaragua's complaint concerning aggressive U.S. actions have perhaps spoken most of all about the need for the strict observance of the basic principles of international relations: respecting the independence and territorial integrity of all states, not interfering in their internal affairs, and settling conflicts through negotiations. Unfortunately, not all those taking part in the discussion invest these words with the same content.

For the overwhelming majority of UN countries taking part in the discussion of Nicaragua's complaint, respecting these principles means halting aggressive U.S. actions against Nicaragua, perpetrated with the aid of Somoza's bandits from Honduran territory.

At the latest session, as in previous ones, the representatives of various countries denounced U.S. intervention and voiced support for the people and government of Nicaragua.

Urging respect for international norms, Congo representative (R. Geyvma) said that the situation in that region threatens international peace and security.

The aggression against Nicaragua is being perpetrated in accordance with a sinister, very familiar scheme, Polish representative W. Natorf said. Its basic elements are economic and ideological aggression, invasion by U.S.-financed and trained mercenaries, and the use of another country's territory for activity of this kind.

The present U.S. Administration treats international norms differently. Official U.S. representatives, while demagogically declaring their readiness for talks, are deliberately setting unacceptable prior conditions. For instance, what is the worth of the U.S. demand that the Nicaraguan Government confirm its adherence to so-called pluralism and a mixed economy, USSR representative O.A. Troyanovskiy asked. It takes no great imagination to realize how the U.S. Government would react were the demand that, for instance, a planned economy be introduced in the United States to be advanced as a precondition for talks with it.

The Soviet Union rejects the imperialist forces' attempts to impose their will on the peoples of Central America and the Caribbean and to suppress their desire for freedom and national security, O.A. Troyanovskiy said. We resolutely oppose the threats, acts of provocation, and pressure against Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada, and other Latin American countries.

A draft resolution prepared by the group of nonaligned states was distributed to the Security Council members. The draft confirms the right of Nicaragua and all other countries of the region to live under conditions of peace and security without being subjected to foreign intervention. The draft approves the desire of the "Contadora Group" of states to organize frank and constructive dialogue between the countries involved with a view to resolving existing contradictions.

Report on Resolution

LD202049 Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 20 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

The UN Security Council completed the discussion of the question of the continuing tensions in Central America and around revolutionary Nicaragua, which has become the victim of an armed aggression committed by the remains of the gangs of Somozist thugs, encouraged by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

A Security Council resolution, adopted at the initiative of a group of nonaligned countries, expresses a profound concern over the threat of an armed conflict between Honduras and Nicaragua as a result of the continuing dispatch of counterrevolutionary gangs and of U.S. military equipment and ammunition from the territory of Honduras. The Council reaffirmed the right of Nicaragua and of all the other countries of the region to live in peace without any outside interference. The resolution approves the efforts of Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama, aimed at resolving the conflict through negotiations with the observance of the principles of non-interference and of the inadmissibility of using the territory of any state for committing acts of aggression.

The course of the discussion convincingly demonstrated that the reactionary circles of the USA support the most sanguinary counterrevolutionary forces in the world. This was said at the concluding meeting by the Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Miguel D'Escoto in his vivid statement. The U.S. Government, he said, organized the aggression against Nicaragua and is behind the counterrevolutionaries. "The United States is the aggressor," he said.

Discussions in the Security Council have demonstrated once again that the world community has taken an attitude of understanding with respect to the proposals of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, and nonaligned states, aimed at resolving by political means the existing, and preventing new, armed conflicts in Central America. As was stressed in the Council, the political settlement in this vast and important area of the globe would doubtless be an important contribution to strengthening universal peace and international security.

The participants in the debate expressed their support for the national leadership of the Sandinista Front of National Liberation, for the Government of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, which are resolutely rebuffing the incursion recently launched against that country by counterrevolutionary gangs relying on the direct support of U.S. imperialism.

The United States came under criticism in the UN Security Council, especially in the light of that dangerous policy of confrontation pursued by Washington which strives by every means at its disposal to prevent the peoples of the area from determining their destinies themselves. Participants in the discussion unambiguously condemned the U.S. efforts to reverse the revolutionary and democratic changes in Nicaragua and to suppress the patriotic movement in El Salvador and Guatemala.

All this is done under the pretext of implementing the so-called "Caribbean initiative" broadly touted by the White House and aimed at defending U.S. imperialism's military-strategic interests in the Caribbean.

The New York journal MULTINATIONAL MONITOR describes President Reagan's "Caribbean initiative" as the continuation of the "big-stick" policy invariably pursued by Washington with regard to Latin American countries. Within the framework of this programme the USA has provided military and economic aid to the tune of over 300 million dollars to the bloody dictatorships in Central America and the Caribbean, and above all, to the Salvadoran regime wobbling under the blows of patriots. As regards the Soviet Union, it has taken the attitude of big sympathy for the efforts of the friendly Nicaraguan people in the pursuit of economic and social changes in its country, and is giving political support and material assistance to the Nicaraguan people. The Soviet Union is convinced that Nicaragua will be able to defend its freedom and independence, and manifests genuine solidarity with the rightful cause of the Nicaraguan people.

SAKHAROV EMIGRATION CONTROVERSY CONTINUES

Refused Medical Treatment

NC211334 Paris AFP in English 1308 GMT 21 May 83

[Text] Moscow, May 21 (AFP) -- Soviet authorities have turned down a request by dissident Andrey Sakharov to undergo medical treatment in the Science Academy clinic here, his wife told Western journalists today.

Elena Bonner, the wife of the dissident academician, said an oral request for treatment that she made to the clinic for both herself and her husband had been refused.

The couple both suffer from cardiac problems, and their three-year stay in Gorki, where Mr Sakharov lives in internal exile, has further worsened their health. Mrs Bonner said that neither she nor her husband trusted the competence of doctors in Gorki.

Mrs Bonner met with journalists in the street because militiamen outside her building bar all access.

She said she suffered an attack on April 25 and was examined at the academy clinic on May 14.

The Sakharovs said about 10 days ago that they would like to emigrate abroad, but the authorities -- through the official TASS news agency -- said Mr Sakharov could not leave the Soviet Union because he held "political and military secrets."

Academy of Sciences 'Indignant'

LD201532 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 20 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS -- The Academy of Sciences of the USSR is indignant at the decision of President Reagan of the United States to officially hold a "Sakharov Day," it is said in a statement of the USSR Academy of Sciences that was published here today. To portray Sakharov as a champion of peace and human rights means to mock truth, to incite the fanning up of the Cold War and to totally ignore the opinion of Soviet scientists. Soviet scientists qualify this act of the United States Administration as a provocation intended to poison the international political climate and further complicate relations between our countries. If utter irresponsibility, the desire to subordinate reason to rhetoric finally triumph in the actions of the top U.S. leadership, this can inflict a tremendous damage to the cause of constructive cooperation between peoples and to universal peace. There can be only one alternative -- mutual respect, thorough search for spheres and regions for fruitful cooperation, including also of the scientists of our countries, in the interests of the progress of the whole of mankind.

MOLDAVIA'S GROSSU URGES GREATER PARTY INITIATIVE

PM170901 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 83 First Edition p 2

[Article by S. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, under the rubric "Party Life; Style and Methods of Leadership": "Initiative and Enterprise"]

[Text] Without doubt one can only count on major success in any matter if one approaches it wholeheartedly and shows initiative and enterprise. There is another truth: these qualities so necessary to a leader do not come about at once. As a rule, they are shaped in the course of work, are fostered and serve as a distinctive indicator of in-depth knowledge, a wealth of experience and the ability to apply creatively in economic practice the principles of democratic centralism which offers, in V.I. Lenin's words, "for the first time an opportunity created by history for the full and unhindered development not only of specific local features but also of local enterprise, local initiative and a diversity of ways, means and methods of moving toward the common goal."

Initiative and enterprise are qualities akin to special talents, and like any talent need to be assisted, improved and developed. It is thus very important that party committees concerned with the correct selection, placement and training of cadres should consider whether or not people promoted to leadership are capable of making effective use of all the opportunities for reaching that goal.

The majority of labor collectives in our republic are successfully fulfilling the production plans and socialist pledges. The volume of industrial output increased by nearly 9 percent and that of agricultural output by 20 percent last year. The targets for the first months of the current year have been met.

But not all results are in keeping with plans and potential. A recent Moldavian CP Central Committee plenum which examined the republic party organization's latest tasks noted that enterprises belonging to construction ministries and some plants and associations under union jurisdiction worked below their capacity in 1982. There were sharp contrasts in the results of work in the development of agricultural production. Opportunities were missed primarily where inertia prevailed.

The development of initiative and enterprise is not a design divorced from life. It is connected primarily with inculcating a sense of dissatisfaction with what has been achieved. It was that which helped the republic, for example, to bring about considerable transformations in grain production -- agriculture's base sector -- at one time. That required much searching and even a certain element of risk. But it was justified.

Indeed, in the postwar years Moldavia's corn yield has risen from 8.1 quintals in 1951 to 30 quintals in 1977. How is it possible to produce more under arid conditions with a shortage of manpower for manual fieldwork operations? In the middle of the 10th 5-year Plan the machine operators in Chadyr-Lungskiy Rayon, beginning with the detachments headed by Hero of Socialist Labor and USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy S. Parmakli and by State prize winner S. Khastoy and continuing with the remaining detachments, boldly went over to a fundamentally new industrial technique of corn cultivation. Close cooperation with scientists was a help. Valuable suggestions by the machine operators themselves had an effect. And then the rayon began to achieve a steady 48-60 quintals and advanced teams 65-80 quintals of corn per hectare.

The venture was supported by the Moldavian CP Central Committee. The experience of innovation was disseminated throughout the republic. Although it has still not been assimilated in sufficient depth everywhere, the corn yield of marketable crops has risen by 12-13 quintals across Moldavia as a whole in the past 5 years. Even during last year's drought, farms produced 41.5 quintals of grain from each hectare.

A vivid initiative and courageous venture always presuppose a creative approach to the solution of a problem. It is often also the case that an innovative proposal, as it were, brings together individual remarks, calculations and observations and ultimately leads to radical changes in the course of a particular matter.

In recent years the majority of the republic's rayons have created large livestock complexes of the industrial type. They have a number of undisputed advantages in comparison with the conventional unit but require a continuous supply of feed of enhanced nutrient value. This was not achieved everywhere. The capacities of state and interkolkhoz pig-breeding complexes were often underutilized. Communists voiced justified concern on that score in their speeches to meetings and plenums. The Moldavian CP Central Committee could not ignore this. As a result of the generalization of remarks and proposals and an analysis of economic potential, specific measures were adopted to provide complexes with well-balanced mixed feed. The outcome was that meat production here rose by 65 percent in comparison with 1981.

Here is another example. For many years now, Tiraspol's 40-letiye VLKSM Knitwear Association has been headed by Hero of Socialist Labor V. Solovyeva. Her attitude to work is marked by a high degree of responsibility, real initiative and enterprise. For many years the collective has overfulfilled state targets each quarter and has improved product quality. Last year every single worker here coped with the production norm. And they are very stiff norms. Given such a situation, the reserves for the association's further development would seem exhausted, it has reached its limit. With the city's manpower shortage, it is also impossible to expand. Nevertheless, even here the leaders' initiative helped to find a way out which was to deploy capacities not in Tiraspol but in the republic's rayons. The first "rural workshop" is now in operation. The production of output which is in great demand is growing.

The development of our economy is now greatly dependent on how successfully efficient management methods are assimilated. Leaders of sectors and enterprises must make active use of new scientific and technical decisions and advanced methods of labor and management and must bring production reserves into operation.

The activity of the republic's Ministry of the Furniture and Wood Processing Industry is indicative in this respect. At one time the sector's development seemed to have run into insuperable difficulties: Moldavia does not have an adequate raw material base. On the initiative of B. Terekhov who heads the ministry, enterprises introduced the waste-free utilization of all available raw materials and the latest methods of processing poor-quality timber. As a result, the mass production of many furniture components has been established in the country for the first time by means of bonding, using veneer strips and synthetic resins. This has led to a sharp fall in the expenditure of scarce materials and to better furniture.

Initiative and enterprise embody the individual's social activeness and reveal a person's attitude toward life.

It is important to approach the solution of each question from a party and general state viewpoint, and not only to ensure immediate individual successes but also to foresee the long-term economic, social and moral consequences of decisions. Life constantly throws up situations where a leader's political maturity is tested in specific practical deeds.

Several years ago, Kishinev's Elektromashina Plant found faults in the planned production process during the assimilation of the production of new types of washing machines. At a number of manufacturing stages, that process produced wastage. What was to be done? Should the innovation be abandoned? No, that course was not taken. The party organization and plant director V. Karabylo showed considerable inventiveness and initiative in finding a rational way out of the prevailing situation. Now over 85 percent of the Blektromashina collective's output bears the State Seal of Quality. Nearly two-thirds is exported.

In such instances, initiative and enterprise are not only facets of work style but also characteristics of truly efficient and profundly party-minded people. Such people know how to combine scientific achievements and the wisdom of experience, bold decision-making and practical expediency. The republic's party organization has reared hundreds of captains of industry who possess a sense of the new, can see the long-term and proceed boldly to scrap management methods inherited from the time when production was developed by extensive means.

But one still meets instances where initiative and enterprise are geared toward reducing targets and increasing funds and correcting plans by considerably reducing them. That was how the leaders of Tiraspol's Moldavizolit Plant acted, for example. Having secured a reduction in the plan amounting to R100,000, they "ensured" a R24,000 bonus for engineering and technical workers and employees. Party committees cannot excuse such workers.

Other executives are concerned not with the search for but the use of reserves and with outwardly favorable report figures. A superficial assessment shows that Moldavia's Potrebsoyuz services worked quite well last year. However, much potential for increasing the volume of procurements and the processing of agricultural produce was not utilized. The Moldavian CP Central Committee Bureau gave a principled evaluation to this and demanded that workers of the consumer cooperative apparatus should not limit themselves to the "execution of instructions" but should display enterprise when engaging in their main work.

We must look attentively to see that genuinely socialist enterprise is not overtaken in some places by self-interest, narrow-mindedness and careerism. This is where the problem's moral aspect rises to its full height. The republic's party organizations are keeping a strict check that methods of achieving economic goals are in accordance with the demands of our morality and legality. We will incisively eliminate that which is contrary to moral norms and Soviet laws.

The qualities needed by the modern leader should also be developed, of course, by actively improving the economic mechanism. The need to revise many obsolete normative and legal acts which often curb local initiative has grown. "It is necessary to create those conditions -- economic and organizational -- which would be an incentive to high-quality productive labor, initiative and enterprise," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted at the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum.

The republic has set up a smooth system for training and improving the skills of cadres at all levels. Party economic aktiv schools and theoretical seminars on modern methods of management and production organization are at work everywhere. Appropriate courses are in operation within ministries and departments. Using advanced rayons and farms as a basis; the Moldavian CP Central Committee holds regular seminars on the dissemination of optimum experience and on worker training as well as scientific and practical conferences.

The republic party organizations efforts are geared toward ensuring that the decisive areas are manned throughout by people who are politically mature and enterprising and who possess organizational abilities and a sense of what is novel.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ON PARTY WORK SHORTCOMINGS

PM171227 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Implacability Toward Shortcomings"]

[Text] Sverdlovsk Oblast's party organizations attach great significance to eliminating losses in production. On communists' initiative, enterprises have formulated targeted comprehensive programs for saving metal, energy resources and worktime. The Urals freightcar plant, Uralmash, the Verkh-Isetsk Metallurgical Plant, and other collectives have set up schools of advanced experience. An oblast thrift survey has been arranged. All this has helped people in Sverdlovsk Oblast save a considerable amount of ferrous metal and electricity and cut labor costs since the beginning of the present 5-year plan.

Good results, of course, are not achieved easily. Difficulties arise during large-scale work, and complex problems have to be resolved. And here it is particularly important that party organizations occupy a militant and combative position and show persistence and implacability toward shortcomings.

"We speak boldly both of existing problems and of unresolved tasks because we are well aware that we are equal to those problems and those tasks and that we can and must resolve them," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov noted in his report "60 Years of the USSR."

The CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum focused its attention on such crucial avenues of work as accelerating scientific and technical progress, increasing labor productivity, increasing the quantity and improving the quality of output, saving all types of resources, and achieving the maximum result with the minimum expenditure. In order to cope with that, party organizations must comprehensively increase working people's activeness by channeling it toward the widespread use of advanced experience and the struggle against whatever hinders the cause and slows down our progress. The importance of this task was again noted at the conference of first secretaries of union republic Communist Party central committees and party kraykoms and obkoms on questions of the development of agriculture and the implementation of the Food Program held at the CPSU Central Committee.

Recently, party committees and primary party organizations have been approaching the analysis of existing reserves more exactingly and have been exposing and eliminating shortcomings more actively. For example, a principled discussion of the social restructuring of the countryside was held recently at a Gorkiy CPSU Obkom Plenum. It was noted that the targets for the first 2 years of the 5-year plan for the commissioning of rural housing are still unfulfilled.

Nearly 100,000 square meters of housing have not been commissioned. Over the year, 140 farms failed to build a single house. And as the plenum acknowledged, the main reason is that the party obkom did not assess the situation in the countryside self-criticially and did not always verify the execution of its own decisions. The plenum outlined concrete measures whose fulfillment will make it possible to rectify the prevailing situation.

Party organizations are expected to pay constant attention to improving their work style. The mania for holding meetings, low exactingness regarding assignments and the adoption of a plethora of decisions on the same questions, which in fact remain unmonitored, are still making themselves felt. Formalism enters party work in various guises. It should be remembered that only efforts that produce a real return and a concrete result are justified. A businesslike reaction to critical remarks and proposals is an inalienable feature of the Leninist work style. Wherever those remarks and proposals are voiced -- at a party or workers' meeting, a party committee plenum or conference -- the speaker must feel confident that his ideas will be heard and examined and that the necessary measures will be taken. And it goes without saying that attempts to persecute people for their criticism cannot be tolerated.

"I have had more than one occasion to criticize shortcomings," labor veteran and communist Z. Ivanova writes from Krasnodaro "And to put it bluntly, the attitudes to this have not been consistent. Not all leaders have taken remarks aimed at them in a principled way. And there have been some who have tried to settle scores and take revenge. On one occasion I even had to go as far as Moscow to obtain justice. It triumphed, but what effort and nervous exhaustion this cost! For some reason it is not always remembered that, according to our party rules, those who suppress criticism must suffer strict penalties, up to and including expulsion from the CPSU. This should be recalled more often."

Sometimes people write to PRAVDA and appeal to other central organs precisely because their city or rayon has not understood them. Everyone is certainly entitled to make such appeals, and work with letters must be improved in all organizations. But the question arises: who specifically is to blame for the fact that people have to appeal to central organs when it is a case of shortcomings that require that urgent measures be taken locally. Much depends on the stance of primary party organizations. They have great potential for actively influencing the elimination of shortcomings and the improvement of matters. The CPSU rules give them the right to monitor the activity of the administration or the work of the apparatus. And it is important to make fuller use of that right to increase the responsibility of cadres for implementing economic and social tasks.

Sometimes a party bureau, a party committee and subsequently an entire primary party organization fail to show due keenness with regard to shortcomings in the work of the administration. Thus serious omissions in the development of agricultural production were exposed at the Put Ilicha Sovkhoz, Krutikhinskiy Rayon, Altay Kray. Director G. Parshukov let many things slide and was not demanding toward the workers. Matters on the farm went from bad to worse. But what was the reaction of the party committee and Committee Secretary A. Volkov to this? In essence they adopted the stance of onlookers. Party meetings avoided awkward points and focused attention on petty secondary questions. Ultimately, the director was relieved of his post and the party committee secretary was severely punished. The fulfillment of the intensive targets of the third year of the 5-year plan require energetic and persistent work on eliminating shortcomings. May success attend every party organization in that work! May they secure even greater results in the struggle to fulfill the tasks outlined by the party!